

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the VREY REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., THE DEANERY, EXETER, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIII ✓

AUGUST, 1936

No. 194

EDITORIAL

THE years 1860, 1889, 1912 and 1926 are milestones in the story of English theology. They are the dates of the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, *Lux Mundi*, *Foundations*, and *Essays Catholic and Critical*. Those volumes, over and above the value of the things which they actually contained, were *felices opportunitate*. They met the needs of the moment. They answered contemporary questions. Accordingly, they mark epochs, and have become historical. No one who ever has occasion to record the development of theological thought in England from 1860 to 1930 will neglect them.

It will be observed that the intervals are twenty-nine years, twenty-three years, and fourteen years. You see, they are getting shorter. We live "faster and faster," as Miss Delafield would say. Have we reached a velocity at which ten years is interval enough? Was it time for the next member of the series to appear in 1936? And, if so, have we found it in *The Church and the Twentieth Century* (Macmillan, 15s.), which has just been published? The answer, at least to the second question, is in the negative. The volume has many merits; and if it does not answer all the contemporary questions, it certainly asks a great many of its own, but it is not in the great succession. It lacks something, and it is more likely to go the way of *Contentio Veritatis*, and to be remembered by students, marking an epoch in its way, but not becoming a recognized milestone. This is partly due to the fact that it is not a concerted volume. The authors have written independently, and there is a remarkable divergence between Dr. F. L. Cross on the one hand and Dr. D. H. A. Major and Dr. Percy Dearmer on the other hand. The Editor has collected a number of Liberals, who are in fact an eleven, but they are not a team.

This helps to dissipate the impression that the book might have made. It has a general purpose, and that purpose may fairly be inferred from the Foreword by the Bishop of Birmingham, and the Essay by the Editor (Mr. G. L. H. Harvey). That purpose is to strip off dead leaves of dogma, to commend Liberal Protestantism, to question the legitimacy of Liberal Catholicism, to encourage Evangelicals, to hope that they will not remain too stubbornly Evangelical but will be attracted with the true fold, and to emphasize the national character of the Church of England. Nevertheless this aim is maintained very unequally by the members of the eleven. Some of them would perhaps repudiate a good deal of it. Some are content to practise their favourite strokes, often with good effect. Some of them hit a good many boundaries. The bats of Canon Rogers and Dr. Raven, who write of "The New Catholicism," as it is seen in Inter-Communion and Exchange of Pulpits, flash bravely and enthusiastically. The total score is increased by a number of wides and no-balls which seem to have been sent down by the official bowlers. But the eleven are not a team.

But this is not the only weakness. There is a deficiency in construction. Dr. Barnes in his Foreword is depressed. He fears that the next generation will believe either too much or nothing. What he would like them to believe is his own attenuated creed. But "there is an element of unreason in man, as inexplicable as the existence of evil." Accordingly, he is filled with what are on the whole very just forebodings. For it really does not seem likely that religious persons will be content with the "empirically reached theism" and "the teaching of Jesus, the ethics most naturally in harmony with such theism," which he offers them as the belief of the future. It is not enough. And yet it is all that he has to offer. The creeds not only include products of "the myth-making fancy"; they may even be said to take a special delight in them. Accordingly, they are a "burden." The Christmas Day Collect is "an offence to many who regard marriage as holy." The "belief that in consecration any priest can associate the spiritual presence of Christ with the elements" is "priestly pretension, rejected by the modern world as an absurdity." By reasons of circumstances, and as described it really is solely by reason of circumstances, "the religious beliefs of most of the teachers are no longer the result of what we may term systematic Christian influence." There is thus "a new Zeit-geist." "The Church of England must adapt itself to this Zeit-geist."

But must it? Why? The exigency is not explained. No principle is mentioned. There is no appeal to reason. Only the necessity of capitulation to the Zeit-geist is assumed, just as it is assumed with simple faith that the House of Commons in rejecting the Prayer Book was "true to the modern outlook." We remember to have read an article written by James Martineau about 1875, in which he countered just such an appeal made by Professor Tyndall with an appeal to another spirit, the Ewigkeit-geist, the Spirit of Eternity. In the Bishop's Foreword there is not much appreciation of anything in Christianity that can be called eternal. The only references of a positive kind to Christian doctrine are an acknowledgement that "in some way or another the fact of the Atonement must be preserved," a quotation from Dr. Tennant's deliberately limited statement of the relevance of Christian theology to empiric theism, and a really fine outburst of the Bishop's own at the end.

Apart from this there is no constructive work. There are such epithets as "superstitious," "tiresome," "waspy," and there is a rather wearisome reiteration of the demands of "the modern mind." Yet, after all, what is this modern mind, that it should sit in judgement on the past centuries, and decide the future? It is rooted in a sort of intellectual Fascism, which might profit by a study of the tenth chapter of Berdyaev's *Meaning of History*. It seems that an excessive consciousness of enlightenment has really impaired the output not of "sweetness" only but also of "light," from a quarter whence much of both these products was plentifully available. Those of us who try to be Liberal as well as Catholic have much to learn from those who use only the title of Liberal. We too have our complacencies and our illusions, which need to be corrected. But we often get less help than we might. The modernist outlook seems not wholly emancipated from the limitations of the Psalmist, who said: "I have hated them that hold of superstitious vanities." But that, to borrow a word often used by modernists, is sub-Christian—and so we are not helped.

Dr. Major in "Towards Prayer Book Revision" has a number of sensible things to say. But he also is obsessed by the "modern mind." Thus, some of the developments which have come about in the Church of England in the last two or three generations have been reactionary. Others are the leading of the Holy

Spirit. No doubt. But Dr. Major is sure that he knows which are which. Again, "The Divine revelation given through the Holy Spirit today must be supreme over all preceding Divine revelations." This is strong meat, though the principle is undeniable. Yet we need to be quite sure that the new thing is really a Divine revelation. And the difficulty is that in the analysis of it here presented we constantly encounter "the modern mind." The attitude is that of a pious Pelagianism into which it is very easy for many of us to slip, but it does not give a good stance for criticism. Dr. Major's revision would in many respects make public worship better, but it is startling to see what large areas of Christian doctrine would disappear if all his suggestions were carried out. Among his excisions are the last two Comfortable Words and all the Proper Prefaces. He seems over-eager to provide a congenial outlet for the wishes of the "modern man," and especially the modern Englishman, and not enough concerned to maintain all the values of the Christian religion. His essay is a useful reminder, but a dangerous guide. There is too much twentieth century about it, and not enough Church.

One of the best essays is that of the Editor. He gives a well-informed account of the development of theological thought since 1860, and he does not quite despair of Liberal Catholicism. It is just possible that "the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Evangelical Plan of Salvation" may survive in some other form. They have their dangers, but they can perhaps be liberalized. At all events "the Liberal tradition has not been the exclusive monopoly of any one party." "It may well be that in the future it will be necessary for the Liberal elements in all parties to unite in the work of stemming the tide of a movement of anti-rationalism." This is good hearing. All reasonable persons are against anti-rationalism.

An interesting letter, not intended for publication, has reached the Editor. The writer, who is a trusted leader in the Church of Wales, asks whether it is really necessary in modern books and on the wireless to refer to our Lord by His human name only. The answer seems to be that there are contexts in which the custom has a certain value. For example, in re-telling Dostoievsky's story of the Grand Inquisitor to a thoroughly secular audience you would probably make at least a partial use of it. It is incidentally instructive to observe that

the only person in the four Gospels who actually addresses our Lord by His name is the repentant robber on the cross (see the Revised Version). As a rule, the habit is surely to be deprecated, as over-familiar. The same correspondent asks why speakers on the wireless so often say, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit." The American Revisers of the New Testament began this, and the habit has spread. Again, it seems to us that different contexts can bear different terminologies, but that there is a strength and solemnity about the words "the Holy Ghost" which it would be sad to lose. There are some who say "the Holy Spirit," simply because it is easier and will be better understood. Others say "the Holy Spirit," and mean only the best instincts of mankind. If you say "the Holy Ghost," you may lose something in the direction of making a link with such instincts, but you are at least saved from the risk of being thought to mean those instincts and no more.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF "THE DISCOURSES" IN ST. JOHN

The following paper was read at a Seminar which was discussing various problems connected with the Fourth Gospel, under the chairmanship of Professor Burkitt. When we had reached chapter xiv. I was asked to state the case on behalf of the Discourses from the conservative point of view. The treatment of the subject was determined by reference to the problem immediately before us.

FIRST a word on the setting of chapter xiv. in its context. Hort, in his Hulsean Lectures (which have taught me more of the meaning of this whole section of St. John than any other single book), points out somewhere that the opening sentence or sentences of xiii. 1-3 describe what the Evangelist, on reviewing his reminiscences, saw to have been in the mind of Jesus throughout the whole scene. We must beware of supposing that the disciples at the time had this key to the meaning of particular utterances. May I interpose a word here on the significance of that fact with regard to the whole record of our Lord's teaching? No one can doubt that, as Matthew Arnold put it, "Jesus was ahead of His reporters." In the nature of the case that superiority was inevitable. And we are bound to face the resulting difficulty in the way of securing any accurate report of His teaching.

That superiority was, no doubt, primarily personal, but when you look under the surface you will, I think, realize that it was also a superiority in what we may call spiritual condition. I find it most helpful to represent it to myself in this way.

Jesus at His baptism entered into the kingdom of heaven, and went into the world to preach the gospel of that kingdom from within. I mean by that, that His religious consciousness attained a higher level of clearness and consistency than was at the time within the reach of His contemporaries: that He attained a new sense of the sovereignty and fatherhood of God which transformed His whole view of life, and that He realized that His duty was to raise men to the same region of spiritual experience.

He is, I think, also represented as conscious throughout that the way by which men could be enabled to rise to His level, and share His experience, lay through His death. Until they could do that, His full meaning must remain in great measure hidden. The wonder of wonders is that He was able to get any part of, not to say His whole, message across the gulf that separated Him

even from the most receptive of His disciples. We cannot, of course, embark now upon an examination of the various ways by which He attained His end. You can see at once how His characteristic method of teaching by parables was bound up with it. My immediate object in referring to it was to enable you to see how natural such a comment as that which we find in St. John xiii. 1-3 is, if it comes from a mind reflecting on words, which had been deeply impressed on it before they were fully understood, when they slowly revealed the depths of their significance in the light of subsequent experience.

Let us pass on then to trace the sequence of thought in St. John's record. The situation as he lays it before us is this.

The unbelieving world is for the time shut out. Jesus is alone with His disciples in the upper chamber. After the expulsion of the traitor, He devotes Himself to preparing them for the trial that is in store for them by the loss of His visible presence, and still more to instructing them in the conditions of the deeper and more abiding communion with Himself that His going away will make possible.

He says almost nothing about the method of His departure. He points once to an approaching conflict with "the prince of this world"; but that is only the means of revealing His love for the Father and His willing obedience. He hints that He is laying down His life for His friends. He speaks once of the hatred of the world that would vent itself in murder. But what He really does stress again and again is the fact that He is "going away." They would miss Him, and find that He was out of their reach, with nothing but the memory of His love for them, and the new commandment, to keep them in spiritual touch with Him.

The prospect was daunting, but He encourages them to meet it in the power of faith, both in Him and in God. The new stage of existence, on which He was entering, was within, not without His Father's house. He was only passing on ahead to prepare a place for them. His departure was to be the prelude to a return, which would make it possible for them to have communion with Him in His new condition. Though the goal of the journeying might be hidden from them, at least they knew the path on which His feet were set.

His goal, as He will tell them explicitly later, is the Father. The way to Him—by walking on which Jesus was kept all the time in living touch with Him—was obedience to His will. Thomas—who, like the rest of us, thinks naturally only in terms of space and time—failed to understand that the goal of which Jesus was speaking was a Person, not a place. He was, therefore, bewildered, and brought his difficulty to Jesus. He

elicited, in answer, one of the deepest of the self-revelations that take the place of parables in this Gospel: "I am the Way and the Truth and the Life. No one cometh to the Father but by Me."

In these words Jesus challenges His disciples to look into their own hearts and see what communion with Him had meant for them. To follow Him had meant, in their experience, progress on the path of duty, with growing insight and ever-increasing vitality. The goal of that path, He tells them—for them as for Him—is none other than the Father.

Here again a genuine human perplexity finds expression through the lips of one of the apostles. We sorely need some help when we wish to focus our thoughts on God.

George Macdonald's experience is typical:

"My God, when I would lift my heart to Thee,
Imagination instantly doth set
A cloudy something—thin, and vast, and vague—
To stand for Him who is the fact of me."

We are grateful, therefore, to Philip, who put our need into words: "Lord, shew us the Father, and we ask no more."

This led directly to an express statement of the way in which, by His whole life of intimate communion in word and deed with God, Jesus had been providing beforehand a perfect answer to this prayer. He passes on to treat of the future when, in union with Himself, after His return to the Father, the disciples should themselves have experience of the working of the same power by which He had wrought His works. The exercise of this power would be conditioned by an intimate sense of communion with Himself. The Church in the world would be the commissioned representative of their invisible Head, and the resources of the age to come would be at their disposal, if they made request to Him, in order that witness might be given to the world of the abiding union of the Father with the representatives of His Son. There is no limit to the efficacy of prayer that has as its object the fulfilment of the Church's commission.

This promise implies, as I said, an intimate communion between the body and its Head. Jesus proceeds at once to define the links, both subjective and objective, by which that communion is made possible. He begins with the subjective. At the root of the whole relation is love: the love of the disciples for the Lord whom they had followed for three years, the abiding fruit of their intercourse. Over this love death itself could have no power, as long as they accepted His will as He had made it known to them in His teaching generally, and especially in the new commandment. For if they did this, they would not be left to their own resources, to meet the demands which their loyalty would make upon them.

He had in the days of His flesh upheld them by His intercessions and by His visible presence and support. Under the new conditions He would be still interceding for them, and even more effectively. For now the way would be open for the bestowal as an abiding possession in their inmost being of the same Spirit which the Father had bestowed on Him at His baptism. They would be in touch with reality, and the Spirit of the reality would be with them, as a friend to face the world with, as effective as the visible presence of the Lord had been in the days that were past. The world would be incapable of receiving their gift. But the disciples would find that He was no stranger.

At the same time it was important that they should realize that the Spirit was in no sense a substitute to take the place of an absent Lord. Jesus would Himself return to them; and their eyes should behold Him, though He would be hidden from the world, because they should be raised to newness of life with Him. When that day dawned for them they should find that they had been admitted into communion with the Father and with the Son in the bond of a loving and loyal discipleship.

Jude here interposes with yet one more question. How was it possible for an objective manifestation to the disciples to be inapprehensible by the world? The answer lies in the conditions of spiritual indwelling. The Father's love could only go out, even to His disciples, if they were loyal to His word. Their understandings indeed were weak, their memories defective. But it was just here that the Holy Spirit—the Comforter—could come to their assistance. He would bring the words that had been spoken to them to remembrance, and make them to understand their meaning.

At this point Jesus begins to take a formal farewell. The regular Jewish salutation, both at meeting and at parting, was "Peace." This, with Jesus, was no mere form. Peace, His own peace, unworldly alike in its nature and in the manner of its bestowal, was to be in no merely conventional sense His legacy to them. His return in the next verse to the appeal: "Let not your hearts be troubled" (with which the chapter began), shews that He had had this end in view all the time. He had not, however, even yet succeeded in delivering them from distraction and fear at the prospect of the loss of His visible presence. They had grasped the fact that He was leaving them, and that He expected to return. But they were still too self-centred to be able to see the coming change from any point of view but their own. They were not so full of love for their Master that their personal loss could be swallowed up in the thought of what going to the Father must mean for the

Son, and of the enhancement of power that unimpeded communion with Him must bring.

Still, the separation must come, and their faith must be tried. And they would have at least the assurance that the trial had been foreseen and prepared for.

Very little time was left for further intercourse. For the lists were already set for His final encounter with the Prince of the world: an encounter in which the adversary would be allowed a free hand, not that he had any right over his victim, but to give to all those over whom he had usurped dominion conclusive evidence that there is One in the universe who loves the Father, and is willing to face even death if it is His will.

At this point the farewell discourse reaches at least a provisional resting-place. We may pause to survey the ground we have travelled as a whole.

The chapter is knit into one, not only by returning at the close to the keynote struck in its opening sentence, but by its insistent repetition of the word Father. There can be nothing fanciful in following this obvious clue to its main purpose.

As it happens, this feature exactly fits with the task that I have undertaken of comparing St. John's record of our Lord's teaching with the record of the Synoptists. For it is the thought of the Fatherhood of God which gives an even closer knit unity to the most familiar of our Lord's discourses, the Sermon on the Mount as recorded by St. Matthew. It cannot, therefore, fail to throw light on our problem if we study side by side these two treatments of a common theme.

Let us begin with the Sermon on the Mount. (I take it for granted that we are prepared to accept it as a characteristic example of the Synoptic record of our Lord's teaching.)

It has been finely described as "the Charter of the Kingdom." I ask you to notice first how it is dominated throughout by the thought of the Fatherhood of God. That thought is really the key to every section of it. The Sermon opens with a description of the characteristics of the citizens of the Kingdom, in the Beatitudes. They reach their climax in the seventh (verse 9): "Blessed are the Peacemakers, for they have the nature and the name of the Sons of God." Then come the two illustrations of the function that the citizens discharge in the world as salt and light. The reward of faithfulness to their trust (verse 16) is that men "glorify their Father who is in heaven," and, as at once an ideal and a promise (verse 48), "Ye shall be perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

We pass to the ceremonial laws of the kingdom regulating almsgiving, prayer and fasting. The constraining motive in each case is the approval of "your Father which is in heaven."

The model prayer is addressed to "our Father in heaven," in the assurance that He knows our needs before we ask them.

In the next section, which expounds our duty towards God in the kingdom, deliverance from the rival service of Mammon, and from the fretting cares of life, comes from the thought that the Father feeds the birds and clothes the flowers and undertakes to supply all the needs of those who give themselves whole-heartedly to His service.

When we come to our duty to our neighbour, our attention is caught by a little inset, on the assurance of an answer to our prayer. It comes from reflecting on the Father-heart of God, and is interposed between the warning against censoriousness and the golden rule.

The concluding appeal in view of the eternal issues of life culminates in the warning, "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of *My Father* in heaven."

We need not look beyond this sermon for evidence of the fundamental character of the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God in the mind of Jesus. It is the warp into which He interweaves the whole of His gospel of the kingdom.

We must not, however, fail to notice the special relation in which the speaker Himself stands to His message. Let us begin with the last verse that we considered in connection with the Fatherhood. "Not everyone that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of *My Father* who is in heaven." He says here, notice, "*My Father*." Hitherto the phrase has always been "your Father." Only once in a context which does not necessarily include, nor I may add exclude, Himself do we find "Our Father." There can be no doubt that in speaking of God as "*My Father*" He implied, as the Jews felt in St. John v., that there was something distinctive in His Sonship: something connected with His Messiahship, because the citizens of the kingdom pride themselves on their outward allegiance to Him, calling Him, "Lord, Lord." And He goes on at once to claim the prerogative of deciding in that day, absolutely, on the fitness of the candidates who claimed His recognition on the ground of the witness they had borne to Him by inspired utterances in His name, and of the mighty works that they had done by the power He had given them.

In the light of this passage we can see that the ninth Beatitude (v. 11) means exactly what it says:

"Blessed are ye when men revile and persecute you and say all manner of evil against you, falsely, *for My sake*; rejoice and

exult, for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

The situation here contemplated is one in which the citizens of the kingdom would be living in a dispensation of the Spirit. All the Lord's people are prophets. Their characteristic work is to bear witness to Him in the face of an unbelieving and persecuting world. For the way into the kingdom was never represented even in the "Galilean Springtime" as a "primrose path." The condition of admission into the kingdom is the same as the test of spiritual kinship as defined in St. Mark iii. 35. The narrow way is determined step by step by the will of God, and at the end of the way, for the citizens as well as for the King, in will, if not in deed, stands a cross.

The substance of the sermon, as we have seen, is a declaration of the laws of the kingdom and of the righteousness of God. Jesus puts it forward with authority in fulfilment of His commission, not merely to carry on, but to consummate the work of Moses and the prophets. In doing so He does not shrink from putting His *ipse dixi* side by side with the voice that spoke on Sinai.

Our more immediate interest in the Sermon is centred on its development of the theme of the fatherhood of God.

The fatherly heart of God is revealed, so Jesus teaches, to those who have eyes to see, in nature. God is the Father who feeds the birds and clothes the flowers. The all-inclusive bounty of His providence is shewn in His largesse of sunshine and rain alike to those who look up to Him and thank Him, and those who do not. Every instinct in the human heart that we recognize as fatherly has its counterpart in Him. He can be content with no lower standard than His own perfection for them. When each man enters into the secret chamber of his own heart, the Father meets Him there. A heart of love is watching over him and there is an ear open to his prayer.

I must resist the temptation to develop the full range of teaching on the fatherhood of God which is concentrated in the Lord's prayer. It must suffice to call attention to the first clause. The first and deepest of all human needs is the hallowing of the Father's name. This must include a development of the sense of the "numinous," a deep and awful sense of the difference between right and wrong. But it includes also a sense of the sacredness of all the means whereby the thought of God is brought home in all its purity, its truth and its beauty to the hearts of men, and specifically by the lives of all those who call upon Him as Father. Men judge of Him by what they see of them. They shew like His children when they love their enemies. In proportion as they let their light shine, men will glorify their Father in heaven.

Such in outline is the teaching on the fatherhood of God in the Sermon on the Mount. That teaching as experience shews is universal in its appeal. It contains, we cannot but feel, the secret of a care-free life, the royalty of inward peace for anyone who can win to the heart of it. Only, as most of us must admit, from time to time it seems to fail us just when we need it most. The bright side of nature is very bright—but it has another side. The grass withers and is burned. In a hard winter the birds are frozen to death. There is another side even to the unlimited bounty of the sun and rain. Is it really the index of a love that triumphs over ingratitude, or of moral insensibility? As far as I can see there is nothing in the Sermon to counter that doubt. Nothing but our Lord's assurance to the contrary. The issue from time to time narrows down to this, Can we take His word for it? Are we prepared to trust God, as Job and Jesus trusted Him, even though He slay us?

It is time to come back now to St. John xiv. This is not, we must remember, represented as part of a set discourse. And criticisms of it, like Sanday's,* which treat it as such, are beside the mark. The record, if it is historical, is a record of "Table Talk." It embodies reminiscences of the salient points of a conversation as they stood out in the memory of one of those who heard it. Such unity as it possesses must reflect so far as it is accurate the mind of the Head of the table. It is natural to suppose that He retained control of the conversation. It would illustrate His habit of mind, and if there was anything distinctive in His outlook on life, it should enable us to identify it.

Now, as we have seen, the Evangelist takes special pains to define the situation with which we are confronted in this chapter. Looking back over his reminiscences in the light of subsequent events, he is conscious of a dominant purpose in the mind of his Master. He realizes that, though the disciples at the table had no grasp of the situation, Jesus was all the time face to face with death, and was doing His best to prepare them for the approaching situation. They were the words of a dying man. He was bidding His friends farewell. He was giving them His parting legacy of Peace.

Furthermore, as we follow the successive stages of the conversation, we cannot fail to be struck by the way in which the thoughts of the company are brought back again and again to the Father. The words are the index of a life dominated by the thought of God as Father. Now that vision is historically distinctive of Jesus of Nazareth. It is His characteristic contribution to the religious thought of the race. We have

* *Authorship and Characteristics of the Fourth Gospel*, by W. Sanday, pp. 221 ff.

examined a classic expression of it in the Sermon on the Mount. But notice, what we have here is not a mechanical repetition of a familiar hackneyed theme. In the Sermon on the Mount the thought was based on purely general considerations, and applied to the common needs and experience of men. Here Speaker and hearers are face to face, not with the bright side of nature and providence. They are met under the shadow of the darkest fact in history. The difficulties which are in the background of the Sermon are upon Him and upon His hearers in all their grim reality. The veil is lifted, and we are allowed to see how in the power of His faith in God as Father He reacted Himself, and would have His disciples react to the fact of death. It is not surprising in the circumstances that He should lay special stress on His own sense of personal relationship. ("My Father" recurs five times as against the single instance in the Sermon. "The Father" absolutely is found fifteen times. It is not found at all in the Sermon. Whereas "Your Heavenly Father," which is constant in the Sermon, is not found at all here.) Jesus is revealing here (as far as any revelation in words is possible) the grounds of the specific aspect of faith in God which He was giving His life that He might impart to His brother men. Let us come then once more to the text of the chapter, and see how the thought of the Father illuminates the darkness, both for the Master and for the disciples.

The source of all the trouble was that He was passing out of the world. The significance of that fact depended not upon the outward manner of His departing, but on its goal and purpose. Now if God be indeed Father, it is impossible to limit His dominion to this world. To pass out of it cannot be to pass out of the keeping of God. In His house are many mansions. Why should we be so disturbed by the thought that Jesus was passing from this room into the next in His Father's house? Even the fear that His passing into closer communion with the Father must involve a permanent separation between Him and us is unfounded. His departure was the creation of a deeper and more abiding union.

Again it was no doubt hard that the goal for which He was bound was hidden from them: but at least His disciples had been long enough with Him to know the path on which His feet were set. He was walking, as He would have them walk, on the path marked out for Him by the will of God. He had taught them so in the Sermon on the Mount.

If that seemed too vague apart from Him, He could only assure them that no step of it need be apart from Him; and it led Him and them straight to the Father. He was "the Way."

In spite of His assurance that through their experience of Him they had already received a revelation of the Father, the disciples still ask for something more definite and tangible. This leads to a careful statement of the way in which the invisible Father had been brought into manifestation in and by His Son. The communion between the Father and the Son had been so close that the only figure under which it could be represented was that of mutual indwelling; a union the result of which is not the absorption of either element, but the perfect expression of the individuality of each.

This language is, I know, repellent to the commonsense Englishman in some of his moods. It is just possible that an illustration given by John Pulsford* may help to overcome this repulsion. He is writing of the strictly analogous mutual indwelling of Christ and the individual believer, but his illustration holds for both. He writes:

"If any man hear my voice, My life waves into Him, becomes rooted and grounded in Him: and henceforth I dwell in him and he dwells in Me. If you ask in what sense, I reply, in the same sense that the light dwells in your eye, and your eye in the light.

"We shall never know the Christ of God until the eternal summer weather of His love is revealed within our souls. He is as distinctly a revelation to our inner man as the revelation of the universe is to our outer man. When the sun and our eye meet and touch we have the revelation of nature: and when Christ and the fine senses of the soul meet and touch, we are at the dawn and beginning of the revelation of the kingdom of heaven."

Jesus Himself explains His meaning to be this. In His life of complete surrender to His Father's will, every word had been spoken by His Father's inspiration, and every act had been done not only under His direction but by virtue of power that came from Him. Every word that He had spoken, every deed that He had done, had, therefore, been at once His act and His Father's. Corroboration of the witness of His own consciousness that this was the fact would appear when they remembered how again and again the works that He had done transcended the competence of unaided human capacity.

This confirmation would be valid in the first instance only for those who had seen the works. Jesus, however, envisages the needs of a time when He Himself will be out of sight, and asserts that this witness will be accessible in increased force after His departure. He was passing into yet closer communion with the Father. His disciples would remain as His witnesses

* *These Sayings of Mine*, vol. i., p. 198.

in the world. They would be commissioned to act as His representatives in close communion with Him. Any prayers to Him in this capacity were assured of an answer. The resultant work, which would be at once His work and His disciples', would redound to the glory of the Father.

I am not concerned at present with the question whether this anticipation has or has not been verified in Christian experience. I would only point out that we have here two remarkable correspondences with the Sermon on the Mount. The claims of candidates for admission into the kingdom on the ground of the mighty works that they had done in His name implies the reality of the partnership between disciples and the ascended Lord in mighty works which is contemplated here. And again, the responsibility of children for the honour of their Father's name, which was suggested in the Sermon, prepares the way for the thought of the perfect revelation of the Father, which Jesus here bids us find in the Son.

We have passed now from the thought of the revelation of the Father, which Jesus gave in the days of His flesh, to the conditions of the communion between Him and His disciples after His ascension. In this connection the Father is represented as giving the spirit of Truth to the disciples in answer to the intercession of the Son. He gave, we may remember, the Spirit to Jesus at His Baptism, declaring at the same time His love for Him. Here we read twice over that He will set His love on those who love the Son in deed and truth.

In the closing paragraph we come back to the situation at the time. Jesus declares that if they knew the transcendent greatness of the Father, the thought that their Master was on His way to Him would fill their hearts with joy. Then in the last two verses He faces the struggle that lies immediately before Him, and declares that so far from being shaken in His allegiance by the way that was appointed for Him, His death was the expression of His perfect satisfaction with His Father and an act of willing surrender to His will.

Such in outline is the meaning that I find in the words, reading them as a genuine historical reminiscence of words actually spoken, and recorded for our learning by one who heard them. As such they are the expression of a transcendent religious experience—the supreme religious experience of all history.

It is, of course, impossible to prove that the consciousness, which is expressed here, is (even if historical) necessarily veridical. But there is nothing to suggest that the Speaker of these words, or the Speaker of the closely kindred words of the Sermon on the Mount, was under an hallucination. The

experience of the apostolic age as embodied in the New Testament is evidence that the hopes which the speaker held out were fulfilled. If they are not historical, we can, I suppose, only regard them as the outcome of the creative imagination of a literary genius at the end of the first century, who had evolved the doctrine of the Holy Trinity with the assistance of St. Paul—and greatly daring, essayed to express the relation of the divine Persons within the Godhead under the conditions of an incarnate life in dramatic form from within. That hypothesis is, to my mind, infinitely incredible.

J. O. F. MURRAY.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VIRGIN BIRTH

IN a recent issue of the *Hibbert Journal*, Dr. G. W. Butterworth in an article "What the Scientists Forget" made a statement that "The Doctrine of the Virgin Birth is difficult to explain and defend, and although precise evidence is hard to obtain, I should surmise that it is being more and more passed over in teaching and preaching. What is certain is that no Anglican theologian of repute would base his teaching of the Incarnation on the Virgin Birth."

No doubt Dr. Butterworth is correct in his opinion, that the Virgin Birth alone is an unsatisfactory basis for belief in the Incarnation; most educated Christian people would prefer that the evidence for our Lord's divinity should be based upon His personality and conduct of life rather than upon His miraculous birth. For personality and achievement are more convincing of merit than a status due to the conditions of birth.

When, however, we turn to examine the influences by which personality and achievement are won, we find that the conditions of birth may be extremely important and can never be regarded as independent factors in personality, development, and activity.

For instance, there can be no question that the attitude of parents towards their children has a profound influence upon the attitude of children towards themselves. Under the influence of a parent's love or friendship a child tends to have proper self-regard and a confident outlook on life; on the other hand, indifferent or hostile parents tend to evoke their child's sense of inferiority and to give a depressive outlook. These reactions may not be produced automatically—other influences may intervene—but in general it is true to say that children tend to "take over" to themselves the feelings towards them

of their parents. In the case of very strong dominant self-ideals we may safely assume that they have arisen in childhood by suggestion from a parent.

There are, of course, elements which affect this "take over"; one of the most important is the sense of reality-value in the suggested ideas. If a child, for instance, feels that his parents' affection is unreal, by being perhaps spasmodic or arbitrary, the "take over" is weakened or prevented. Edmund Gosse in *Father and Son* mentioned how at first he regarded his father as unerring as God until his father admitted a mistake, and then he lost all faith in him.

The process of acceptance is well described by our Lord in the parable of the Sower: first the seed, *e.g.* the idea, then the sower, *e.g.* the parent or other agent, and finally the soil, *e.g.* the personality of the child or other person.

Regulating this process as an unconscious part of it is the mental mechanism known as the subject-object relation or, a better term, the personality-principle. This spiritual mechanism is selective and regulates the quantity and quality of the impressions we receive. Without this mechanism the mind would be overwhelmed by the innumerable impressions automatically registered upon it; the extent of possible human knowledge is far greater than one mind can grasp. What single human mind could be competent to deal with all that goes to form such a ship as the *Queen Mary*, let alone the vast range of human knowledge in other directions?

It is obvious that a selective mechanism must and does exist to regulate the effect of environment on the human spirit. The intimate and persistent effect of this mechanism can be seen in all phases and directions of life. The factors which affect this selective process of taking or rejecting impressions are obviously very important. On the subjective side, the most important is the content or idea of selfhood and on the objective side, those ends, objects and ideas which give pleasure. Jesus explained this important psychological situation in His simple statement, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." The treasure is the wealth of life, and the "heart" is the sense of personality. Our personal development depends upon our sense of personality and spiritual values. The self-value a person attributes to himself has an all-pervading influence on the quality and extent of his activities.

This pride or self-value is often a serious difficulty in life; it can become so easily depressed or artificially inflated. He is a wise man who can maintain his self-feeling in a true relation to reality. It is a deeply impressive study to see how Jesus maintained the reality-value in His sense of unique Sonship to

God. For self-value must have a reality-value of some sort. No normal person can consistently maintain a phantasy self-value which is unsupported by the facts of his experience. If he succeeds in some degree of self-deception, the false basis of his pride becomes evident to his associates. Over-fond parents often inspire their children with a false sense of worth which the children discard with much pain in the course of life.

We find then that the conditions of birth and the attitude of parents often have a most intimate effect on the personality and achievements of their children, first by suggesting the attitude of children towards themselves, then by inspiring value in this self-feeling, and also the reality-basis of this value. As a rule these elements are unified by a dominant "treasure" from the wealth of life, such as art, science, literature, mysticism.

We may be helped to see this process more clearly if we take a vivid example from an autobiography such as the well-known one of Dr. John Gibson Paton, the famous Victorian missionary of the Scottish Presbyterian Church. He was born in 1824 at Kirkmahoe near Dumfries. His father, James Paton, was a small stocking manufacturer, whose personality was deeply affected by a conversion-decision to be a Christian when he was about seventeen years old.

"My father," said John Paton, "had a strong desire to be a Minister of the Gospel; but when he finally saw that God's will had marked out for him another lot, he reconciled himself by entering with his own soul into this solemn vow—that if God gave him sons, he would consecrate them unreservedly to the Ministry of Christ, and the Lord saw fit to accept the offering and open up their way. He lived to see three of us entering upon and not unblessed in the Holy Office."

"Each of us (there were eleven children) from very early days considered it no penalty but a great joy to go with our father to the church; the four miles were a treat to our young spirits.

"We had, too, special Bible readings on the Lord's Day evenings—mother and children and visitors reading in turns with fresh and interesting question, answer and exposition, all tending to impress us with the infinite grace of a God of love and mercy in the great gift of His dear Son, Jesus, our Saviour."

It is easy to see where John Paton got a reality-sense in his father's religion.

"The 'closet' was a very small apartment having room only for a bed, a little table and a chair. This was the Sanctuary of that cottage home. Thither daily and oftentimes a day, we saw our father retire and 'shut to the door,' and we children got to understand by a sort of spiritual instinct (for the thing was too sacred to talk about) that prayers were being poured

out there for us. We occasionally heard the pathetic echoes of a trembling voice pleading as if for life, and we learned to slip out and in past that door on tip-toe, not to disturb the holy colloquy. The outside world might not know, but we knew, whence came that happy light as of a new-born smile that always was dawning on my father's face; it was a reflection from the Divine Presence in the consciousness of which he lived.

"Though everything else in religion were swept out of memory my soul would wander back to those early scenes, and would hurl back all doubt with the victorious appeal: 'He walked with God, why may not I?'"

Owing to his father's large family and poverty, John Paton found great difficulty in acquiring the necessary academic qualifications for the Presbyterian Ministry, to which he had dedicated himself in his boyhood. After much self-denial and effort he was given a post as lay missionary in a poor part of Glasgow, and it was not until 1858, when he was thirty-four years old, that he became a Presbyterian minister, and set sail for missionary work amongst the cannibal tribes in the New Hebrides Islands. He met in Glasgow with so much opposition to his missionary enterprise that he wrote to his parents for advice and received the following letter: "Heretofore we feared to bias you, but now we must tell you why we praise God for the decision to which you have been led. Your father's heart was set upon being a Minister, but other claims forced him to give it up. When you were given to them, your father and mother laid you upon the altar, their first-born, to be consecrated, if God saw fit, as a Missionary of the Cross; and it has been their constant prayer that you might be prepared, qualified and led to this very decision; and we pray with all our heart that the Lord may accept your offering, long spare you and give you many souls from the Heathen World for your hire."

John Paton completely identified himself with the Christian self-ideal, and knew himself to be a Christian missionary, and expressed his personality and found achievement in winning souls for Christ from the heathen world.

This is no doubt an exceptional instance, but the same process is evident in the development of all human personality-patterns and activity. Personal influences are supreme in human life.

When we turn from these movements in ordinary men to the personality of Jesus, can we assume that He underwent the same process of development? There are two preliminary points to be remembered: first we know nothing about human life in itself, nor indeed of any life, we only know its expression; the second point is that with a common human "make-up" of inherited capacities and apart from physical peculiarities, babies

are born much alike the world over. The differences in personality-patterns are not inborn, but are produced by reactions to environment. The same is true of differences within a culture-form; what we call genius, talent, etc., seems to arise from a greater use by the self of its inherited capacities rather than from a difference in the inheritance of capacities. Galton's "Inherited Genius" was too hastily assumed. The correct situation seems to be described in our Lord's parable of the Pounds. Human nature differs in the use men make of the Pound—*e.g.*, their natural endowment.

Shall we say that the personality of Jesus was different from ordinary men because He was uninfluenced by His environment, and His personality arose spontaneously from a unique inheritance? It is certainly true to say that He resisted in a truly amazing degree some of the current ideas of His times, especially about God's character, and the nature of His Kingdom, but He accepted other ideas of truth in the Jewish religion. He very closely studied the Old Testament, and was well aware of the prophets' difficulties in evangelism. Surely there was no unconscious automatic resistance in our Lord's nature to environmental influences. The subject-object relation functioned normally as in human nature as a whole, and His acceptance or rejection was from conscious decision. He was subject to personal influences like the rest of us, and especially from His mother, who was closest to Him.

Remembering again our complete ignorance of what life is in itself, we may still ask whether Jesus was different from the mass of mankind by having a pre-existing human personality. What did He mean by "I" in His statement "Before Abraham was I am"?

Was it necessary for Him to learn, for instance, the sequences of logical thought, the use of correlation, language expression, or the differentiation of Himself from objectivity? That He was well aware of the importance of understanding the "other side" is seen in His parable of the Unmerciful Servant. Was it necessary to "sow" ideas in His mind, or did they arise from His pre-existing personality-content? These questions are perhaps answered for us in the Quicunque vult, He was "perfect man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting."

Assuming then that in His human nature Jesus was like as we are, we should look for the dominant ideas around which He unified His personality-pattern and directed His creative energies. These ideas are obvious in His life; they are, first, a conviction of His unique Sonship to God as His Father, and secondarily His self-ideal as the King or Sovereign of God's truth in human life.

The organization of disciples to preserve this truth was secondary to the inspiration of truth itself. These personality-ideals were held with a complete conviction in their reality and with a true sense of self-value in relation to them.

How did they arise? Putting aside the possibility of an abnormal uprise from a pre-existing personality-content and assuming a normal human experience, they must have been "sown" in Him by someone whom He loved and who believed in their truth. Just as John Paton was inspired by his father with a vocation to be a Christian missionary, and men have been inspired down the ages with genius in all directions of human activity, so it seems that Jesus was inspired with a unique sense of Sonship and Kingship by His mother.

There is the further question to ask, "How did the Blessed Virgin Mary get a sense of reality in her son's unique relationship to God, and of His destiny as King of an eternal Kingdom?" In the case of John Paton's father, the sense of reality-value in religion came to him by virtue of a conversion, and he "got over" to his son this reality-value; in the case of the Blessed Virgin it would be necessary for some objective evidence to convince her of the reality of her Son's divine origin and kingship. Phantasy wishes would not give her an adequate sense of reality. If the Blessed Virgin believed the Annunciation, and if the birth of Jesus took place when she "knew not a man," these facts would give her that unquestionable evidence of reality in Sonship and Kingship which Jesus "took over" from her. And no doubt her husband Joseph would accept the facts also.

But there is a great deal more in the matter than this. It is not suggested that the divinity of our Lord depends solely upon the reality-value which His mother had in the circumstances of His unusual birth. There is the history of the development of the sense of Sonship to God and Kingship over men in the life and evangelism of Jesus, and in the history of the Church by which we find evidence that bears out the claims made for Him by His mother.

We properly rely upon this practical expression as the main support of our faith and devotion, yet on a human analogy it is difficult to believe that our Lord would have held as intensely as He did to the conviction of His unique Sonship to God without some incontrovertible objective evidence such as the Annunciation and a virgin mother.

L. W. LANG.

CERTAIN GREEKS: A STUDY IN PASTORAL OPPORTUNITY (Continued)

III

TOC H

Bless'd be the day when moved I was
A pilgrim for to be,
And blessed also be the Cause
That thereto moved me.

Bless'd work that drove me back to pray,
To strive to be sincere;
To take my Cross up day by day,
And serve the Lord with fear.

To seize the road from doubt to faith
For feet beside mine own,
To climb from self to purer breath,
Unknown and yet well-known.

He that seeks me shall now be sought.
Surrendered here I stand,
A truant eager to be taught
His purpose for my hand.

REV. P. B. CLAYTON
(after John Bunyan).

"THE letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." All who had any share in the building of Toc H were deeply aware of this truth. They knew that Toc H was a strange name for a religious society, that it did not explain things much to say that Toc was the Army signaller's T, and T.H. the initial letters of Talbot House, Poperinghe. For what, then, was Talbot House and what significance had it for days of peace and for younger men who had never marched in uniform? There was a very natural demand for further definition, but the builders of Toc H hesitated to give it, not only because it was difficult, but because they were afraid of it.

They were afraid of wrapping this living movement in a strait-waistcoat of words. They were afraid of misinterpreting the past and of robbing the future. I can remember long, careful conferences in which we hesitated to put words to paper in case we gave the movement a twist in the wrong direction. Sometimes I wondered if the early days of the Christian faith were like this—newcomers eager to get any word of enlightenment from St. Peter or St. Paul as we were from Tubby and Pat, treasuring each outburst of remembrance, reluctant to tie ourselves to any written principles of faith or organization, clinging not to abstract truths but to a dynamic tale, conscious of a deep binding together, a rich corporate life and a stream

of power coming from something that had happened in the past and was happening in the present. For Toc H, like Christianity itself, is first of all a tradition. It is the result of what happened at Talbot House in the days of war, and an attempt to recapture the same essential vision and experience in the days of peace.

That is why the enquirer is given such books as *Tales of Talbot House* and *Half the Battle*, why he is told a story before he is introduced to abstract principles.

If we would understand Toc H, then, and understand its significance for the parish priest, we must first try to understand what the original house meant to the men who used it, and what part the padre had in forming that meaning.

Tubby was the innkeeper. The "old house" stood in the first place for hospitality, and the modern Toc H remembers this tradition in its succession of Guest Nights and its Marks (or hostels) always with a guest chamber. It is said that the Army authorities countenanced Talbot House, and even planned it, as an effort to strengthen morale at a time when men were tortured by the long horror of the Salient. The House was to bring men back to the source of their morale—home. In the least homely place in the world, Talbot House was to be a corner of home where men could feel that they were men again. Y.M.C.A. huts and Church Army huts were doing excellent work, but under circumstances which limited their achievement. They were institutions in an institutional world. Talbot House was to be different, and Tubby Clayton, the last man born to be an institution, was doubtless chosen as its innkeeper partly for that reason. "Talbot House happened," I have heard Tubby explain with the partial verity one expects from genius, "because I was a failure as an Army chaplain; they had to find me something more informal." So the House was taken, a real house. Pictures were hung on the walls, and even carpets brought in to make it as much a "corner of home" as possible.

It was significant that the Army should turn to the Church for an example of hospitality. It was also significant that the Church had to take special measures, beyond its normal ministry, to give this example. There is a tale that a Staff Officer walked along the Poperinghe street when a chaplain was painting the signboard of the new club.

"What are you calling the new show, padre?"

"Church Home."

"Church Home! That won't do. You must get a better name than that. It will keep men away—at least the men we want. You must leave 'Church' out of it."

There's the pity of it. From one point of view the Church

is the home of sinners, a society given to hospitality. But the man outside does not seem to know. For the Church is also the army of the saints, and in its repeated attempts to seek a working compromise between the two ideals it frequently fails to present one or other of them convincingly to the world outside. Striving on the one hand to keep standards of membership sufficiently high, and on the other to give ready welcome to the sinner without, we have made painstaking efforts, from popular services and free pews to billiard tables and Church football teams, making the Church so "attractive" sometimes that it has ceased in places to bear any convincing resemblance to the Church of the Crucified. But thousands of men outside have not been attracted thereby. They have not felt at home. Something else was needed.

Toc H in part has met that need. Its hospitality has been recognized and accepted. It has succeeded in winning men who before time looked askance—winning them, in the end, to the full corporate life of the Church. And I think it has done so largely because it has been, by its very nature, free from some of the difficulties which hampered the Church. For Toc H is not the Church. Inspired, born, nurtured by the Church, it is yet not co-terminous with the Church. Its membership is open to men who cannot give assent to the Christian faith in its fullness. Within Toc H they work side by side with those who do. *The peace-time movement, like the original Talbot House, is, so to speak, a half-way house. And therein lies a great part of its value to the Church.*

From time to time keen members of the movement wish to reform it. They would make it another Church society, confined to men who not only accept the full obligations of Church membership, but go one better than the ordinary nominal Christian. They are misled by the fact that Toc H as it is depends on a proportion of members who do, in fact, go one better. And they are encouraged by zealous priests who have little use for "half and half" societies. If they succeed, they may no doubt strengthen the Church by providing a body of disciplined men pledged to active service. But in doing so they will fail to meet a need which at present Toc H supplies. The movement will no longer give such hospitality to the man who avoids organized Christianity, nor will it provide opportunity to the parish priest to know intimately men whom he might not know in the normal course of his ministry.

Toc H, however, does more than give an introduction. If it did no more than this the parish priest might well dismiss it with the various social functions, from public dinners to flower shows, which give him the acquaintance of hundreds of men,

who are ready enough to exchange small talk and even to subscribe to Church funds. On the surface, Toc H, indeed, often seems to do no more than this, and chaplains have frequently failed to realize the opportunity offered, because they have not been enabled to look beneath the surface. If they had they would see that Toc H both gives and demands more. It gives a quite definite and distinctive pastoral method. It requires a sympathetic study of this method and time to employ it.

In the "old house" there was a notice: "Take the risk of meeting the padre." It was a real risk. It is meant to be a real risk in Toc H today. In part it is provided by the endowment of a limited number of full-time chaplaincies. But to a far greater extent it depends on the active co-operation of ordinary parish priests who become chaplains, and work with a team of keen Christians within their local branch group.

The notice did not say: "Take the risk of listening to sermons." And the new chaplain is sometimes puzzled and discouraged by the fact that he is expected to attend meetings regularly without being asked to address them or even say the prayers. He is so accustomed to the platform or the pulpit at most of the meetings he attends that he may wonder whether it is worth while to give so much time to a small body of men who seem, on the surface, to expect nothing beyond good fellowship and occasional advice. Why all this bother to recruit an occasional Scoutmaster or sidesman? Is it not done more easily by direct approach? The doubt exists more strongly where the branch is not steadily recruiting new members, and where the pastoral significance of the Toc H job is not fully appreciated by the leaders of the branch, more especially the chaplain.

Distinctive of Toc H is the organization of its members for social service. It will illustrate the chaplain's opportunity if we consider what he can do (a) to guide this activity to its fullest spiritual fruitfulness, and (b) what he can do to prevent possible misuse.

In every unit there is a "jobmaster," whose duty it is to introduce the members to suitable openings for social service. To the societies concerned, this is a useful means of recruiting voluntary helpers. To many members of Toc H it is the means to deeper fellowship, the moral equivalent for war. To others it is a means whereby the Church, identifying with Toc H, can fulfil its social function. But to the chaplain it is more: *it is a means by which souls may be won to a more vital experience and a deeper knowledge of the Christian faith.*

It meets the need of the man who finds faith difficult but wants to do something. "Padre," said an ex-service man,

"this war was a bit too much for me, but if I can help . . . ?" And there have been many such. Normally they would have strayed far beyond Christian influence, unknown to any clergyman, avoiding church attendance because they felt it would be hypocritical on their part, yet looking wistfully at the faith and corporate life of the Church and sympathetic with much of its activity. Within Toc H, in companionship with Christian men, with access to a priest, known, trusted and able to help them, they have slowly found their way back to faith and peace.

It also meets the spiritual need of younger members, whose initial difficulty has not been too much experience, but too little. Nothing has happened to them to give them that "pain in the mind" of which Studdert Kennedy wrote. Two illustrations will show how what I call the "Toc H Method" may work: We invited some of our students in Rangoon to form themselves into a medical mission, accompanying a doctor on Sunday mornings to Burmese villages in the jungle, helping to bandage patients and dispense medicines. One of these students came to me after his first expedition. "Let me go again, sir. I never knew such need existed." Previously he had seldom attended church. But this experience changed his whole outlook and conduct. He saw implications of the Christian faith he had not known before. And he was aroused and attracted where before he had been indifferent.

A young Toc H member, a Scoutmaster, rehearsed his disappointments and anxieties. Some of the boys in his troop were "hopeless." He had lectured them and exhorted them. "But have you prayed for them?" I asked. And he found, not only a way of helping his boys, but a meaning in prayer and a way to a deeper, more vital religion.

In all this Toc H helps to meet the same essential need emphasized, as we have seen, by the Scout Movement: the need to provide men with that full experience of life in which faith is born, nourished and enriched. It is a commonplace of much modern teaching to link faith with experience. In doing so we think rather of the faith which was formulated in past ages, and the experience which it interprets. But the connection does not belong to the past alone. *Experience not only made the creeds. It helps us to understand them. In the modern world the parish priest is called to do more than teach the faith; he is called to prepare the hearts of his people to receive it—the hearts as well as the minds.* They have to be convinced of the relevance of Christianity, of the need for religion and better religion. Many are not convinced because their aim in life is too low, or their sympathy too narrow. If a youth thinks that it is enough for him to be a member of Little Belham's smart set, he may very

well think that he has no need of Divine grace to realize such an aim. But once let him feel that he ought to change Little Belham's smart set, or relieve Whitechapel's poverty, and better still, once let him try to do it, and he may feel the need of something greater than his own small ability. Just as the Scout Movement takes the city boy beyond the walls which hide the glory of God revealed in earth and sky, so Toc H takes him beyond the barriers of our modern social compartments to the challenge of God revealed in human nature.

To accomplish this, however, there is often need for the vigilant ministry of the padre. There are jobmasters who fail to see the full possibilities of their service. They *ought* to try to introduce the suitable man to the suitable job, considering not only the man's qualifications and ability to do the job but what the job may do for him. They should be ready to risk failure at times. And they should be alert to move a member from one job to another, training him for greater responsibilities. But many jobmasters fail to do this, even when the matter is explained to them, and there is much here that the padre can do by patient council and a ready regard for opportunities.

In other respects, too, the "job" system needs careful attention. Toc H has presented the Christian invitation to its members in the form of a challenge to give rather than a promise of benefit. By this appeal to what is generous in man, it has aroused response in contrast to the failure to win men by providing them with billiard tables and other bribes in the name of legitimate recreation. There is a danger lest Toc H itself, in its zeal to find openings of special service for its increasing membership, should support philanthropies which rob men of their manhood by treating them as paupers. This is no argument against discriminate charity. There is need enough for that. But it is an argument against indiscriminate social service. If Toc H is to serve men fully, it must serve them by challenging them to be their best and supporting those efforts which encourage self-respect.

And of course there is always a subtle spiritual danger in any circumstance which makes man his brother's keeper. Priests know too well the temptation to self-satisfaction which comes when the poor man at the gate has been sent on his way rejoicing. I believe that Toc H has been singularly free from any smug complacency or damnable condescension. The service given is virtually anonymous, given as "a member of Toc H," in the spirit of men who say humbly that "service is the rent we pay for our room on earth." But units are not so exempt from what may be termed corporate pride, a desire to prove their merit by an imposing record of jobs done, whilst individual

members are sometimes tempted to set limits to duty and shelter from further challenge behind the record of what they have done.

They may also take shelter from the challenge of life itself. There are men who seek escape from their own doubts and fears in a hectic round of good works. They seek to forget themselves. But the doubts and fears are not answered thereby. In certain cases, where a man is too jaded by intense inner conflict to face a decisive battle, it is good for him, for a time, to find relief in healthy activity. And such activity, as we have seen, may lead him to new springs of faith. But every man, if his religion is to be deep and real, must sooner or later face his own doubts bravely and win the battle within. Otherwise he may either become a shallow busybody or be crippled by the fear that one day the foundation of his life will crumble. The fear will only become more insidious if countered by the desperate pretence that it does not exist. There is much empty counsel about the dangers of introversion. Rightly understood, Toc H avoids the danger, and avoids it with the help of chaplains ready to give wise spiritual direction when needed.

It comes to this: like all high callings the Toc H way of service is a dangerous enterprise, with pitfalls for the unwary soul, but one that does indeed lead to Calvary. And it is very well worth while for a parish priest to give much time and thought to a unit of men with such possibilities of spiritual progress, however small that unit. He will look for his return not in the number of men recruited from Toc H to run his Scouts and clubs, but in the spiritual progress of the members themselves.

The Toc H job, however, is not only a road to faith, it is the support of faith already attained and a commentary on a familiar text, "Faith without works is dead." Most priests know how their own faith is strengthened by the exercise of their ministry, and some can remember the spiritual strain of the last days of their training, unable to "take in" any longer, yearning to "give out" to give a fuller expression to the burning faith within. And the joy of release and activity! Many of the laity have no such joy. Sermons which bid them exercise their religion in workshop and home are in some cases vain; for many a man today is required to do routine, monotonous work which gives little opportunity for the exercise of any virtue except patience. If he is to live at all it must be in his leisure time. Some one has said that the great practical problem of the twentieth century is the right use of leisure. Toc H encourages men to use their leisure in ways which confirm faith and enable spiritual progress.

It is no part of my present purpose to write on every aspect of Toc H, but something should be said about the Ceremony of Light which begins, "Let us remember our elder brethren." For this practice indicates the dynamic of Toc H activity. It has, too, a wider significance, for churchmen generally.

One of the first avowed objects of Toc H was to "preserve amongst men and to transmit to future generations the traditions of Fellowship . . . manifested by all ranks during the great war." No selfish pursuit of pleasure, it was felt, could do this. Men learned fellowship in the war days because they were joined together in a common purpose. Another purpose similarly unselfish was needed for the days of peace, and this was found in social service. There was, too, a special urgency, since so many men who had previously given this service had fallen in the war. Both statements are true enough, but they are not a sufficient explanation.

What most inspired the founders of the movement was a deep remembrance of the fallen, and in many cases it was more than a remembrance, more than a conviction that the sacrifice of the dead could only bear fruit if it inspired sacrificial lives in those who were left. For here were men who had seen Eternity. Death could not separate them from those who had gone before. The tragedy of the war had brought them to a new vision of the Church Triumphant.

It is doubtful, perhaps, whether this means so much, or quite the same thing, to newer generations of Toc H members who did not serve in the war. I never fully understood its original meaning until I stood one day with Tubby and five or six other chaplains in the Upper Room of the Old House. As Tubby spoke we felt how deeply conscious he was of a fellowship unseen. In this little chapel where so many men had knelt in communion with the Risen Lord he was joined to them again in an experience too deep for human speech. And he had always been joined to them. It was this which had made Toc H.

Time will shew whether Toc H can keep the vision and pass it on to younger men who have known no such deep experience. But there is profound instruction in the fact that a movement which perhaps more than any other in recent times, at least within the Empire, has sought to make this world a better place should be inspired by men who looked beyond it to things eternal. "Practical Christianity" is sometimes contrasted with otherworldliness, to the contempt of the latter. The two are joined together in Toc H, and in this fact there is inspiration and challenge to all who would keep the Church true to its deepest experience and fullest possibilities.

IV

THE GROUP MOVEMENT

"This movement is certainly doing what the Church of Christ exists everywhere to do. It is changing human lives, giving them a new joy and freedom, liberating them from the inhibitions and strains which have hindered them, from the faults of temper, of domestic relationships, and the like which have beset them, and giving them a real ardour to communicate to their fellow creatures what God has given to them."—HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

On the subject of the Oxford Groups, I write with considerable diffidence, for my experience here is more recent, and my knowledge, though first hand and personal, limited.

Those best qualified to speak for the Group Movement reject the suggestion that they have any new wine to offer; their wine has been long stored in the cellars of Christian experience and tradition. Their teaching is the teaching of first-century Christianity. They do not claim that it has been forgotten throughout the subsequent centuries. Many, indeed, have taught it and lived by it, and many today, who know nothing of the Groups, emphasize, in their own way, the same essential truths. What is preached is not new doctrine but a revival.

The challenge of the Four Absolutes, for instance, has always been made by vital Christianity. It may be questioned whether it is a sufficient summary of the Christian aim in life to say that we must try to be absolutely honest, absolutely pure, absolutely unselfish and absolutely loving. But it cannot be questioned that Christianity is a claim to full allegiance without weakening compromise, and this is the main purport of the Four Absolutes. In essence there is no new doctrine, no new practice here. It is part of the daily duty of the faithful parish priest to get into the tent of excuses where so many nominal Christians seek to shelter from the sterner atmosphere of Christian duty and aspiration.

Some of us know only too well how often we have allowed a false sympathy to encourage weak souls in a surrender of principle, how often we have tempered the message to the strong winds of opposition. What we do not always realize is the wide range of the mischief caused by under-statement. If there are men who have been deterred by the nature of the Christian challenge, there are others who have been hindered because they have never heard it stated boldly enough. One reason for the appeal of the Group Movement is its insistence on a definitely higher way of life, clearly, confidently asserted.

Toc H has made a similar demand, with similar results. Men expect to be challenged to the highest in the name of Our Lord; and many a parish priest can testify how souls have been helped by a firm insistence at a difficult moment.

The Group Movement has been equally clear in its attitude to personal sin. "The modern man," said a distinguished scientist some year ago, "is not troubled about his sins." But the experience of the Groups has proved, if any proof were needed, that the distinguished scientist was mistaken. Although the modern man may have bluffed about his sin, he knows well enough where the shoe pinches, and he has lost faith in those well-meaning crusades which seek to enrol him in high enterprise before he has kept his vigil. The Group Movement has been criticized for its apparent blindness to the social message of Christianity, but has it not been right in its insistence on the prior importance of personal religion? Men who have lost their manhood cannot reform society, and self-confidence is not the road to faith. But here again there is no new wine. The whole Christian Church is pledged to preach the forgiveness of sins.

Much, however, depends on the way it is done. Perhaps with Bunyan's picture of Christian at the Cross in our minds, we sometimes speak of Sin in the abstract, as if one act of repentance could free us from the whole burden, all in a moment. But that is not the way it happens. We break free from sins, painfully, one by one, and the Group Movement has helped men by helping them to know their sins piecemeal and to undertake the steady discipline of daily surrender. The use of the term "surrender" leads to misunderstanding. When a man states that he has surrendered and means to be absolutely honest, pure, unselfish and loving, he does not mean thereby that he thinks he has achieved perfection. The victory is a victory of will, not of deed. It is a beginning. And this fact is emphasized by all that is taught concerning the use of the Daily Quiet Time, in which men seek to be responsive to the further illumination and challenge of the Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, the Movement claims just as definitely that certain sins can be left behind: jealousy can be rooted out, lust finished with. One of our most qualified writers on the spiritual life has pointed out the mischievous implications of the term "besetting sin"—the popular misunderstanding that forgiveness of sins means that we can trust a merciful God to understand and look the other way when we go on committing the same old sins again and again. Then comes the weary question: What is the use of self-examination and confession, bemoaning the same old sins from which there seems no relief? It is perhaps in meeting this particular situation that the Group

Movement has been most useful to many earnest souls—pilgrims, but very disconsolate pilgrims. They have gained new confidence by a new practice and discipline which has enabled them to bear witness, in all humility, that they have found release from certain definite sins which beforetime bred despair.

"In all humility," for the victory is attributed to the grace of God. "*My grace is sufficient for thee.*" That is central in the message of the Group Movement, and *a great part of its value is its power to convince men that this is not just a dream of self-deluded men but a living fact.*

Now in all this there is no new wine. There is urgent emphasis on a great spiritual need, which may have been ignored in a routine of lesser purposes not so distinctive of the Church's great ministry, but there is no new teaching, and, in essence, no new practice. Many parish priests can doubtless claim that by teaching the faith and by the ministry of the Confessional, or other means, they have helped men to the same discipline and salvation. If so, I cannot see how they fail to rejoice that souls, who for some reason or another have not found this ministry, have been helped by the Group Movement.

What we are seeking, however, is some way in which the experience of the Group Movement may help us to a more fruitful exercise of our ministry. In part we have found it in the exposure of a spiritual need, and the necessity to meet this need by clearer teaching on Christian truths which do not seem to have been fully emphasized. But it is the practice rather than the teaching of the Groups which is most illuminating. I know that it is said that the Group Movement has no new methods, but this claim is scarcely consistent with the procedure of a House Party. It is sufficiently novel to challenge attention and criticism, and many who experience it for the first time find it so unexpectedly different from other religious meetings that they are bewildered.

The best thing for a parish priest to do is to attend a House Party for himself. The Party will probably last a week. Early in the proceedings a team of people will, one after the other, in brief speeches, not longer than three or four minutes each, speak simply of spiritual changes which have taken place in their lives since they came into touch with the Group Movement. There may be a dozen of them, and it is quite possible that the listener will be bored by what seems a monotonous repetition of the same tale. But it is not the function of the speakers to *entertain* their audience. Their task is to *convince* them, and to convince them of one thing: "*My grace is sufficient for thee.*" The convincing power lies largely in the fact that all of the speakers, different as they

are, young and old, men and women, doctors and shoemakers, prodigals and respectable elder brethren, have the same essential tale and the same joy. They are deliberately chosen to this end—a team so different in age, upbringing, experience, temperament, nationality . . . everything . . . that in itself it removes one of the most dangerous of modern misapprehensions: the misapprehension that religious faith is possible only to certain kinds of people. Again and again one meets the objection: “No doubt it’s excellent for other people. I’d like to be a religious man myself, padre. But it’s not for me, I’m afraid. I’m not built that way.” And arguments fail. But the persistent testimony of men and women, one after another, built in very, very different ways, carries conviction. There is no preaching, no argument, and often the speech is halting and poor, for the best witnesses are frequently the least expert speakers. But as men listen, they begin to see unsuspected possibilities. The man who has struggled hard against some secret sin for years, and doubted if anyone else had quite the same battle, suddenly looks up with new hope as he hears a speaker say quietly and convincingly that he has been granted victory over just such a sin: the happy-go-lucky youngster who has never troubled about these things is roused to a deeper view of life by the fact that another man in the same college has troubled about them.

Such results are the first purpose and the first justification of the practice known as Sharing. There is a widespread misunderstanding that the men and women who give their personal testimony in this way have lost the reserve which is natural to British people—if they ever had it. It may be so in a few cases, but in very few. I have given my personal testimony several times, and every time I have hated doing so. There has always been the temptation to keep back the things which it was difficult to say. Preaching would have been very much easier.

But not so useful! For we live in an age which demands evidence. It is not an age content to deduce things from accepted first principles. The spirit of induction has spread far beyond the laboratories of science, and men ask for facts first. If God is a living reality, and not just the substance of our dreams, what is the experience which confirms our faith? Theories as well if you will, but facts first. That is the demand. It explains the interest in inquisitive questionnaires and the popularity of biographies; it explains, to a very large extent, the appeal of the Group Movement.

If this is a need, a real spiritual need, and I know it, can any dislike of personal display, any love of reticence, any jargon

about the "dangers of spiritual nudity" or the Englishman's reserve, entitle me to inactive silence, when I know the need, know I have had an experience which may help others if I share it? That was the question I had to answer when first asked to give my testimony. I did not like it in the least. I still don't. I am sorry that some people have to be reached in this way! Just as I should be sorry to plunge into a river to rescue a man from drowning. It doesn't help matters to say that it would be better if he had broken his leg because I dislike getting wet. It is no part of my power to determine the nature of the victim's distress or alter his need by lecturing him. I can only take it as it is and adapt my methods accordingly.

But if the testimony is given for a special purpose, it is also disciplined for that purpose. Things better left unsaid, at least in public, have doubtless been said at House Parties. The Group Movement is no more foolproof than any other movement. But indiscriminate "sharing" is quite definitely discouraged. When experience is shared in order to help another soul, selection is made of those things relevant to the issue under consideration. To this end the testimonies to be given in public are frequently pruned in consultation with the rest of the team or the leaders before the meeting. It is no more valid to argue that public testimonies should not be given because occasionally some of them are harmful, and others futile than it would be to veto sermons because some are heretical and many are ineffective.

Much of the most valuable "sharing" is not done in public at all. During the House Party the visitors decide for themselves which members of the team are most likely to help them, and seek their advice. The help given often takes the form of sharing some personal experience which may encourage the enquirer. Here again is nothing new. Many a parish priest has done the same, seeking, for instance, to help his confirmation candidates in their battle against youthful temptation by sharing with them his own failures and difficulties. Incidentally, it may be remarked that "sharing" is not regarded as a substitute for sacramental confession.

At any House Party there is a constant ministry behind the scenes, the older leaders often leaving the platform work to others that they may give themselves to confidential talks with enquirers or help those who, perhaps for the first time, have taken their place in the team. In this ministry it is frequently found that younger men are able to help older men more experienced than themselves, and even more advanced in the spiritual life. There is, of course, a danger that enthusiasts,

babes in Christ, with zeal surpassing their wisdom, may injure souls they are not competent to assist. But this is minimized by the co-operation and discipline of the team under more experienced leaders. In any case, what is the remedy? To leave such proven opportunities of ministry to those we may not consider sufficiently qualified, or to attend and give what contribution we can? Many a priest has gone to his first House Party, drawn thither by the spirit of enquiry or his own personal need, and has remained and gone to other House Parties because of the abundant new opportunities he has found for the exercise of his ministry, in council on the team or in personal interviews.

The whole House Party is disciplined and directed to one purpose: to enable those who have not already done so to surrender themselves as completely as they can to the Will of God. After what has been said on the subject of surrender, it will be seen that such an act involves no repudiation of former discipleship or of the grace of God. Even a priest, long dedicated to God's service, may be able to affirm, truthfully and humbly, that this new experience has led him to see some new way in which he can more fully yield himself to the love of God.

The House Party, then, is normally designed to initiate a beginning of the Christian life, but something is done to give advice for the days ahead, and this is chiefly done by instruction and example in the proper use of the Quiet Time. To seek the Divine Guidance for the normal routine of daily life, members are encouraged to set aside some time each day, usually in the early morning, for quiet meditation. The question of Guidance is one that troubles many minds. It is said that the Movement encourages immature enthusiasts to discount reason and act on the assumption that impulse is guidance, and every idea which comes to them forcefully in the Quiet Time, an inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The criticism is, I think, in part justified. But within the fellowship much can be done, and is being done, to show that reliance on guidance does not mean the denial of reason but rather its proper exercise. It is too large a question to discuss here in detail, but one or two questions may be asked in passing: Are we not as Christians, whether associated with the Group Movement or not, committed to seek the Divine Will, and are we not more likely to know it in what we choose to call big things if we are, in practice, seeking it daily for little things? God does indeed use man's reason, but are we more or less likely to reach valid conclusions with or without some prior recollection of His Presence and quiet dedication of self? And dare we limit the ways of God? It seems a fact, attested by religious experience, that God guides men by direct illumination, and

often at times of spiritual crisis such as those first moments of the new life experienced in the Group Movement. Afterwards the soul learns to trust more in the exercise of a reasoning power, dedicated to God's service, and less on special illumination. My limited experience makes me hesitate to say more, but such as it is, it leads me to think that it would be better if this could be more frequently and more plainly stated within the fellowship of the Groups.

For the Movement is essentially a fellowship in which each is prepared to learn from the other. In the House Party and after the House Party the Movement depends not on the leadership of outstanding men, but on the co-operation of quite ordinary people held to new vitality by the bond of their deep spiritual friendship. And the practice of sharing has its second purpose in the maintenance of this friendship.

It is in this fact of fellowship that the Movement has perhaps the greatest significance for the parish priest. Every congregation of worshippers, of course, is meant to be a fellowship, and every parish has its groups co-operating for one purpose or another: intercession for foreign missions, Sunday Schools, preparation classes, Mothers' Meetings and even bazaar committees. But have we enough Groups deeply bound to each other in constant prayer and active companionship for the one great, central purpose of the Church: the conviction of sin and the gift of life?

When I first made enquiries about the Group Movement, a brother priest surprised me by the nature of his advice: "If you can, start a Group within your own parish, confined to the members of your Church"! It seemed to me contrary to the nature of a Movement which confessedly unites Christians of different denominations. Now I think I understand his meaning. The Group Movement, rightly understood, creates no new society for the men and women it influences. It sends them back to the corporate life of their own churches. Asked what a House Party had meant to him, a student in Burma replied, "Often enough I had criticized the Church, but I had not realized my own responsibility." It is for the Church to show the new enthusiast the nature of his responsibilities. And also the nature of his privileges, helping him to find new significance in familiar means of grace, and to appreciate the value of the discipline provided by the Church. For the spiritual life needs development. It is not enough to leave the House Party with a determination to set aside half an hour each day for quiet meditation. Someone is needed to shew how that half-hour can best be used. It is not enough to be willing to follow guidance. Someone is needed to help the beginner

to distinguish guidance from impulse. And all this can best be done in the corporate life of a team (or teams) composed of fellow churchmen united by the same vision and zeal in which the parish priest and the older members will, by example and precept, lead the beginner to a fuller employment of the Church's means of grace.

Without such provision the new enthusiast is often bewildered. In his zeal to change lives he may go beyond his spiritual strength and "wear thin." In his anxiety to avoid this and to maintain his own inner life he may turn to "pale copies" of the House Party, fellowship meetings for mutual edification rather than teams for active service. For the Group itself makes no adequate provision for the further development of the Christian life. It does not claim that when a man has attended a House Party he will know all that is to be known of the Christian way of life. He has still much to learn from his own spiritual teachers. The question of "continuance" is a question for the Church.

This has led to the criticism that the Movement does not "follow up." But if it did it would expose itself to another criticism; it would be accused of building a corporate spiritual life in rivalry with the Church—in fact, a new sect.

As it is, the Movement leaves it to the Church to provide this corporate life, the only effective means of continuance. From time to time, and for special purposes, supporters of the Movement may form teams with supporters belonging to other churches. But the centre of their loyalty will be their own parish church: the fire which feeds the flame of their devotion will be the fire from the altar they have served before, but now seek to serve more faithfully.

And need it be urged how great a help such a team may be to a keen priest? To them he is still a leader, still a pastor, still exercising a priestly ministry which in some respects they cannot share. He finds new strength by sharing with them some of the difficulties of his manhood, a new power in prayer offered by spiritual companions, a new meaning in Our Lord's description: "Ye are My friends." He finds a means of grace to counter the temptations which come to many a priest from the sense of isolation and bitter loneliness. He finds it at the cost of being prepared, for the sake of the Cross, and in the strength of the Cross, to give himself more freely, sharing with his fellow men not only his knowledge and wisdom, but his human failures and the triumphs of God's grace.

When I first came in touch with the Group Movement I hesitated before the cost of this fellowship. And I disliked the seeming impertinence of young enthusiasts who could believe

that I, a priest of the Church, had something to learn and something to surrender. In the secret chamber, alone with God perhaps. But before men I had held myself so long a teacher and a leader, however limited. In this I was less ready than a brother priest I met last year in India. When I suggested that he should go with me to a House Party he replied: "I know nothing about the Groups, though I've heard of them, of course. But I know what a poor parish priest I am. If anything can help me in my ministry, I am willing to learn."

R. H. L. SLATER.

MISCELLANEA

OUR LORD'S TEMPTATION

ON p. 64 of *Christus Veritas* the Archbishop of York says (I compress his words) that in so far as a man has any desire incompatible with the character that is being formed, his Will does not yet wholly exist. This statement seems to me to correspond with experience. By the grace of God desires which once betrayed a man into sin cease to be felt as desires at all, as his character is transformed, and his will unified, becoming more subject to the will of God. The saint may be more conscious of his sinfulness than the ordinary man, but that is because, his spiritual perception being heightened, he recognizes as sinful desires which the ordinary man regards as quite harmless, *not* because he has never grown out of the sinful desires of the ordinary man. This, I think, is universally admitted. Would not Perfection then mean that a man on seeing his duty would also be incapable of feeling *any* attraction towards *any* other course? In Dr. Temple's phraseology, could any alien desire distract a Will wholly perfect?

Following this line of thought I cannot see how our Lord can have been really attracted in any sense that we can call temptation towards an action that he knew to be wrong. He could have been conscious that it would be agreeable to appease His hunger, but not seriously inclined to do so. For once in a way I find Dr. Temple's argument (on p. 217 of *Chr. Ver.*) unconvincing.

This seems to lead to a dilemma. If, knowing that it was wrong to turn the stones into bread, He yet desired to do so, His Will was not perfectly formed, and He was not God. If, on the other hand, He felt no such desire, the reality of the temptation seems to disappear. The Devil tempted Him, but He felt no temptation.

The solution which has satisfied me is to take *πειρασμός* to mean, not temptation in its ordinary modern sense, but rather "circumstances in which right decision is difficult"—a cumbrous expression, but one which covers, as it ought to, both torture and luxury.

There are not many passages in the New Testament in which *πειρασμός* must mean "inducement to sin"; and to take it as meaning "difficult circumstances" (which is better, I think, than "affliction") would make several passages easier to explain—e.g., the Lord's Prayer, 1 Cor. x. 13, Lk. xxii. 28.

The Prayer Book talks of "resisting" temptation, but is not that quite unscriptural? "Endure" would seem to be more correct. One can endure or escape from difficult circumstances, but to resist them is often futile.

Life, then, is a continuous series of decisions, and *ἀμαρτία* is making the wrong choice. A man often finds it difficult to decide even under normal conditions which is the right path, because his Will is not wholly conformed to the Will of God; and *πειρασμός* is a set of circumstances which makes right decision even more difficult than usual, and *ἀμαρτία* more likely—a severe test of character.

If this can be allowed, our Lord was certainly tempted even more than we are. He was constantly faced with circumstances which made right decision and action immensely difficult. But to say that He was tempted in this sense involves no statement that He was *inclined* to do what was wrong—only that circumstances made the right action extremely difficult both to discern and to practise. It seems to me nonsense or blasphemy to say that He felt the pull of evil just as we do; but that is what Heb. iv. 15 ought to mean according to the ordinary use of words, and the S.P.C.K. One Vol. Commentary (*ad loc.*) quotes Holmes thus: "Only he has felt the full force of temptation who has never yielded to it."

There is no indication in the Gospel account that our Lord had any even momentary inclination to do as the Devil suggested. He had decisions to make, and they were difficult. His character was *tested*, but was found flawless; but He was not tempted in the modern sense of the word.

This solution satisfies me; but what troubles me is that other people do not seem to have been so much struck by the difficulties of our Lord's Temptation. And since the phrase in the Lord's Prayer is always a stumbling block, I do not know why, if my solution is permissible, it is not generally adopted. The varied meanings of *πειρασμός* are well known to cause difficulties of interpretation, and if the theological and exegetical difficulties both disappear in large measure by selecting one interpretation, it seems odd that words like "resisting" and "yielding," which imply a wrong interpretation, should still be used by theologians.

Is there any other interpretation of *πειρασμός* which both leaves our Lord's perfect Will unimpaired by any alien Desire and allows a real *πειρασμός*?

P.S.—My suggestion greatly simplifies the old difficulty of distinguishing between temptation and sin. A boy passing an orchard is tempted to take an apple and doesn't. He is told that he has been tempted and has not sinned. It may be perfectly right to praise the boy, but surely not in those words. In feeling the desire (which we ordinarily call being tempted) to take an apple he has in fact sinned, and he ought as he grows in grace to be able to pass the orchard without feeling that desire at all. The *πειρασμός* temptation lies in the circumstance that it is physically possible for him to sin, coupled with the undeveloped state of his character. For more developed Christians there would be here no *πειρασμός*.

But the difference between temptation and sin ought not to be made into one between desire, and action to fulfil the desire. It is the far greater difference between circumstances (complicated by character) and a wrong decision. In our Lord's case circumstances were not complicated by any weakness of character, and so, difficult though His decisions were, they were right.

E. F. SYNGE.

THE USE OF THE WORD *ZOE* IN THE GOSPEL AND EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN

How much a reader of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John must miss without some knowledge of the two Greek words both translated "life" in the English Bible! The Twentieth Century New Testament at times makes some distinction as in St. John x. 10, where it prints Life with a capital "L"; and in verses 15, 17, with a small letter; but it is not consis-

tent, for in St. John v. 27, "As the Father hath life in Himself," life has no capital "L"; in the next line, however, "Life" as belonging to the Son has a capital "L."

A careful study of the use of ζωή in the Gospel will shew that it is used of the Life of the Father and of the Son (St. John v. 26 and i. 4). This ζωή the Incarnate Son brought to earth that He might impart it to men (St. John x. 10, 28).

If we contrast with this the use of ψυχή, also translated "life," we see it has a very different meaning. In St. John x. 15, 17 it is ψυχή that our Incarnate Saviour says He will lay down; this surely was the human life assumed in His Incarnation, and that was perfected in His supreme and all-sufficient sacrifice. He had power to lay it down and to take it again, as He did in His glorious Resurrection.

If we turn to St. John vi. 33, we read that our Lord spoke of Himself as "the Bread of God which cometh down out of Heaven and giveth ζωή unto the world." And in verses 51, 53 we read "The Bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give for the ζωή of the world." And "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no ζωή in yourselves." It was through His Flesh and Blood, His perfected humanity and life (ψυχή) laid down, that the Heavenly Life, ζωή, was to be imparted to men and nourished within them.

It is the same teaching in 1 St. John v. 12, 13, "He that hath the Son hath ζωή, and he that hath not the Son hath not ζωή."

In St. John's Gospel ζωή is surely used to express that quality or character of Life which is inherent in the Father and the Son, and which God desired to impart to men through the perfected humanity of our Incarnate Saviour, "who loved us and gave Himself for us."

With us men ζωή, the heavenly life, is given to us in and through the Lord Jesus Christ and is meant to grow in power and extent, uplifting, sanctifying our whole human nature, our ψυχή, that we may be fitted for the Heavenly Life hereafter.

With our Saviour, the Word made flesh, it was the inherent ζωή which took the ψυχή in His Incarnation, perfected it in His supreme sacrifice and glorious resurrection, and accomplished by it for man that which man could never have done for himself.

We parish priests have surely seen the working of the Heavenly ζωή in human lives. Once men thought the earth was the centre of the universe and that the sun revolved around it; now we know better. So a man, who at one time seemed to think of himself as the centre to whom others, and even God, should be subservient, has his eyes opened to the truth; he then makes God the centre and takes the Lord Jesus Christ into Himself to rule within. Thus the influence of the new Life, ζωή, changes everything, making him "a new creation," uplifting, sanctifying his whole natural life, his ψυχή. This has been recently demonstrated in many places in the work of Oxford Groups; but in a Christian family there need not be any sudden change, rather a steady growth from infancy onwards in an increasing beauty of Christian life and character.

We profess our faith in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of Life, ζωή, and who can say how soon He begins His work?

Only a little helpless Babe
Laid in a manger cradle,
This was what the shepherds saw
That morning in the stable.

But in that Babe there dwelt a LIFE
Straight from the source in Heaven,
A LIFE that in the love of GOD
Would soon to men be given.

Only a little Bread and Wine
Offered to GOD in prayer,
But when He gives them back to us
The BREAD of LIFE is there.

The LIFE HE gave to us in love,
At our Baptismal birth,
Is nourished thus that we may live
An Heavenly LIFE on Earth.

If only the word Life, where it is the translation of *ζωή*, were printed with at least a capital "L" it would be a truer expression of the Greek of the Sacred Gospel and Epistles.

HUGH H. BIRLEY.

THE CANAANITISH WOMAN

THE note of the Rev. R. J. Morrice on the incident of the Canaanitish woman, in the June number of *THEOLOGY*, brings to mind a note of the late Dr. Edwin Abbott in "The Son of Man" (vol. viii. of his monumental *Diatessarica*), which is helpful in considering the apparent and inexplicable harshness of our Lord's attitude to this woman in distress.

Dr. Abbott suggests the following:

(a) The woman throws herself at Christ's feet. The disciples attempt to prevent her.

(b) Jesus says "Let her alone," using the Aramaic *aphàs* as an exclamation addressed to all the disciples.

(c) The disciples say: "It is not meet to take the bread of the children and to cast it to the dogs."

(d) The woman, appealing to the Lord against His disciples, says: "Nay Lord, even the dogs . . ."

The use of *ἀφες* according to this hypothesis would be similar to that of *ἀφετε* in Matt. xix. 14, "Let the children (alone) and do not hinder them from coming," where the parallels Mark x. 14, Luke xviii. 16, have "Let the children come and do not hinder them." And the situation would be the same. The disciples intervene to prevent approach to Jesus, and He rebukes them.

J. R. PRIDIE.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus LIV., Fasc. i. et ii.

This number contains among other new items an interesting article by M. M. Coens, entitled *Anciennes Litanies des Saints*, and one by M. Paul Peeters—*Sur une contribution récente à l'histoire du monophysisme*, but the one which has the widest appeal is that entitled *A propos du manuscrit 49 de la Reine Christine*—by M. Paul Grosjean. Selections from this

collection of MSS. have recently been published, edited by Dom Wilmart, with the title *Analecta Reginensia. Extraits des manuscrits latins de la Reine Christine conservés au Vatican.*

The collection is described by Dom Wilmart as *Catéchèses*, or notes for instruction. We should rather call them sermon notes. Both editor and reviewer think that they emanate from the so-called Celtic Church, but while Dom Wilmart attributes them to the Celtic Church of Cornwall and Wales, M. Grosjean sees evidences, both in language and thought, of an Irish origin. They were compiled originally in the eighth and ninth centuries, reaching their present form somewhat later. The collection is an anthology compiled from various sources.

"Le Reginensis 49 est donc vraisemblablement une anthologie, un résumé de divers commentaires, une série de plans de sermons, amorçant simplement les développements, à l'usage de prédicateurs qui, après avoir digéré tant bien que mal cette érudition, prononceraient, ou peut-être écriraient, leurs sermons on langue celtique."

We have, then, a first-hand collection of the notes which an erudite monk of the ninth century thought would be useful and edifying to put in the hands of a preacher of his day. We have, of course, mediæval sermons, but we cannot at the moment recall any such notes for sermons. They are, therefore, of considerable interest especially to preachers; it is to be wished that the complete collection could be published.

The number also contains short notices of a large number of *Publications Hagiographiques*, a term which is given a very wide connotation. These notices are most valuable. Few works of interest in any language that bear on Church History escape the Bollandist net.

C. P. S. C.

REVIEWS

THE ESSENCE OF JUDAISM. By Leo Baeck. Translated by Victor Grubweiser and Leonard Pearl. Macmillan. 16s.

JESUS, PAUL AND THE JEWS. By James Parkes, D.Phil. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

Baeck's defence of Judaism has existed for over thirty years, and is at last available in a good English translation. The attitude of the Church to the Jewish religion is perhaps more intelligent than it was in 1906, as is possibly that of the Jews to Christianity. The contacts of Montefiore and Abrahams have had a reconciling tendency. Chiefly Christian apologetics have had to drop a quite false view of the uniqueness of our Lord's moral teaching, and Jewish students to recognize His real prophetic originality. There are points of view in Baeck that are irritating and unreasonable; but it is eminently desirable for the Christian student to realize that true and tender teaching of God's Fatherhood and the sonship of humanity, which are regarded as specifically Christian doctrines, were indeed of the essence of Judaism, as the slightest knowledge of the Jewish Prayer Book will shew. This is even today assumed to be untrue in popular preaching, while the depths of the *actual* originality of Christ's teaching are still unplumbed.

The book is divided into three parts, treating respectively: (1) The Character of Judaism, its continuity and development in the Prophets, and its uniqueness as compared with other religions. (2) Its characteristic ideas: Faith in God, Faith in man—i.e., ourselves, our neighbour, and mankind generally. (3) The story of its witness to its profession, and still living Messianic hope that one day the world will accept its message and live in the light of a faith which is intrinsically that of the real relation of a God, who has commanded the true path to be followed, and men who are made in His Image, and therefore ideally exist to do His Will.

Though exposition and Rabbinical quotation are carried to a weary length, the essential ideas of Judaism stand out clearly in Baeck. The writer is Kantian both in his doctrine of God's commands and man's capacity to fulfil them; if man has failed or sinned he can always make the atonement, which simply consists in a return to duty. The Torah, or teaching, is the proclamation of the categorical imperative without any possible compromise, the voice from the hidden God to the open sphere of manhood, which must express itself in action or "the deed"; and this "ought" of moral duty, God's sole expression, awakes

response in man His free image—ought implies can. There is no question of the ability of all to obey and translate the word into deed. Equally Kantian and unique in ancient religion, according to Baeck, is the Jewish conception of their relation to their fellows; in spite of much that history would question, he avers that the essence of the true Judaism has ever been to regard and to treat each human being "as one and no one as more than one," defending his thesis from Jewish treatment of slaves, but he says nothing of the attitude to women or to neighbouring races. The uncompromising hold on the command which becomes life, aided by such community and family rites which have naturally grown, are responsible for the preservation of the Jewish community, which possesses even in the severest persecution a power of expansion, a *joie de vivre*, a faith without dogma, an outlook on majorities and worldly successes not without irony, and an assumed certainty quite unique.

Baeck does not state his attitude to Christ—possibly it is similar to Klausner's—but he criticizes St. Paul and the Christianity of the Church and German Protestantism of his day. The Pauline conception of the Law is simply a confusion owing to the poor translation "Nomos" of the LXX; ceremonial and moral ordinances both wrongly come under the term; it is a blunder accountable for much. The fault of Christianity is that it makes salvation depend on Creed or intellectual adhesion, as compared with Judaism, which is a simple relation resting on the reality of the moral Law; it therefore limits its "Grace" to believers, whereas Judaism is open to the whole of mankind. But Baeck claims that Judaism is always just to other religions: "The Messianic mission of Christianity and Islam has been acknowledged by Judaism. . . . The two most eminent thinkers of the Middle Ages, Jehuda Halevi and Moses Maimonides, express the idea openly. Though assured of the truth of their own faith, and though convinced of the future triumph of their own religion, they none the less declare emphatically that Christianity and Islam 'are preparing for the Messianic times and leading up to it,' and that they have succeeded in spreading the word of the Holy Scriptures to the ends of the earth."

Baeck's conception of the development of the Messianic idea is first that of a Davidic King, then of a pure community redeemed by suffering, an eschatological period lightly skated over, and finally the Kingdom of God yet to be attained by human effort.

His arguments rest on the two poles of the uniquely given moral Law, and on the ability of mankind as a whole to respond

to its demands. It is obvious how alien the ideas of a Saviour and of Grace are to this.

The faults of Judaism lie in its idea of God, but far more in a belief in man, which all history refutes. To expose the failures of this book at length, one would have to shew the deficiencies of pure Kantianism as a philosophy of religion, to examine Jewish history to see how much water Baeck's assertions of the superiority in practice of Jewish ethics hold, and in defence of Christianity to examine its vastly wider doctrine of God, its doctrine of man so all-coherent with human experience, its syncretism whereby it absorbed Hellenic culture as it does other cultures today, and to inquire: What, after all, has made Christianity universal in its appeal? At the same time there is much that we can accept gladly from Baeck; he shews how the ideal of religion which he constructs out of the poor actual reality of Judaism is in the main in line with Christ's fulfilment, which is the life of Him and His Kingdom, though this he would not admit.

The new book by Dr. J. Parkes, author of *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, is a great Christian scholar's endeavour to soften the antagonism between Christ and the Pharisees, with the best of whom He must have agreed in many ways. Dr. Parkes thinks that Christ attacked not Pharisaism itself, but its illegitimate additions. He examines the Gospels from Mark through Q, Luke, Matthew and John, to trace an evolution of anti-Pharisaism in the infant Church, which in all its phases up to the extremes of the Johannine account is represented as our Lord's own expression and mind. Again, the Jews whom St. Paul opposed were not Palestinian Rabbis, but those of the Greek cities; he did not separate himself from his Jewish brethren, but adopted a position of loyalty to the essentials of the great heritage, which were common to him and them, and which he taught had found their completion in the Gospel.

This is certainly a book that should be read. Its liberality of tone will reveal to Jewish readers how Gospel criticism may possibly open up ways to the solution of difficulties, while Christian students will find new ideas which they will have to consider side by side with the old.

W. J. FERRAR.

THE REFORMATION, THE MASS, AND THE PRIESTHOOD. By Ernest C. Messenger. Vol. I., The Revolt from the Mediæval Church. London. Longmans. 18s.

On the credit side this book is comprehensive, conceived on a scale adequate to its subject, admirably arranged, clearly and forcibly written, fully documented, and extremely provoca-

tive. On the debit side it is full of inaccuracies, constantly dependent for its facts and documents upon second-hand sources, unusually perverse in its method of treatment, and valueless in its conclusions.

The inaccuracies may be dealt with first because, though they have little bearing on the argument, they are often an index of the author's capabilities. To find St. Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechetical Lectures* ascribed to A.D. 386 (p. 12) does not inspire the reader with confidence in the author's familiarity with Patristic literature; yet in the first part of the book there are a number of sweeping statements about what the Fathers taught. On p. 28 he out-Popes the Pope, for by describing St. Hippolytus as "Bishop of Rome" (p. 28) he implies the coexistence of two Supreme Pontiffs at the beginning of the third century. Moreover, even though St. Hippolytus lived at the time when Greek was giving way to Latin in the Church at Rome and familiarity with the Greek tongue was rapidly disappearing in the West, we can hardly suppose that the Bishop would have allowed himself to speak (as Dr. Messenger does) of "two Anaphora." In the field of contemporary literature Dr. Messenger is also somewhat uncertain. The name of perhaps our foremost living scholar in the field of English Church History is consistently misspelt (pp. 310 *f.*). The forms "Haddon" (on p. 311) and "*Lollardry*" (on p. viii and *passim*) in the title of Gairdner's famous book—both of them names with which our author must have had constantly to deal—suggest slovenliness and hurry. It is unwonted for an English writer to refer to the city of Shylock and the Rialto as "Venedig" (*cf.* p. 16). With errors and curiosities of this nature the treatise abounds. In some books they would not count for much. But when an author is largely concerned to print documents, they at least suggest that his work need controlling all the way. The reader who wishes to examine Dr. Messenger's powers of transcription can compare a passage on p. 311 from the pen of Dr. Jenkins with the original ("Warton" has become "Wharton"), and another on pp. 520 *f.*, from *Liturgy and Worship*, where "chrysom" has become "chrism." That he is constantly dependent on second-hand sources, Dr. Messenger does not endeavour to conceal. Indeed, after mentioning in his Introduction a long list of modern treatises (many of them excellent in themselves) from which he has derived assistance, he adds: "These we have supplemented by our own researches." We are quite willing to believe that this has been Dr. Messenger's method of work—to study the modern works on his subject, and subsequently to eke them out by recourse to the original sources. We thought, however, that the right way to write history was

to begin with the original documents and texts, and to consult modern writers afterwards.

We come (after these trivialities) to the book itself. Though self-contained as far as it goes, it is only the first of two volumes. It falls into four parts. The first hundred pages deal with "The Mass and Priesthood in Scripture and Tradition," and contain an outline and well-documented account of the development of the subject down to the sixteenth century. The second hundred or so pages deal with the Continental Reformation, also excellently set out. The rest of the book—well over 300 pages more—deals with the English Reformation under Henry VIII. and Edward VI. The book will give the "layman" with no technical knowledge of theology just the kind of information he needs in order to grasp what the issues confronting the Church in the era of the Reformation were, but just the wrong information to enable him to form a proper judgment about them.

As we have intimated, the treatise is written with a strong polemical purpose. We are told on the title-page that the special concern of the book is to be with the question of Anglican Orders; and though we have only Part I. of the book before us, it is already too patent to what conclusion Dr. Messenger will lead us. We are told incidentally in the Introduction that our author is going to argue "that the validity of Anglican Orders must depend ultimately upon the view taken as to the correctness of the Anglican or of the Catholic theological standard" (p. vii). This is a surprising assertion. We had always supposed that (for a Roman Catholic, at any rate) the validity of our Orders depended ultimately upon certain *facts*—correct form, correct matter, correct intention, or correct something else. But here validity is made to depend upon a *view*. Such a doctrine, surely, is the most rank Protestant subjectivism. We suspect, however, that Dr. Messenger has not expressed exactly what he meant to say.

The leading thesis of the book is that the Reformation in England was a much more "Protestant," not to say more political, affair than is commonly supposed; and even such Roman Catholic scholars as the Abbé Constant and Mr. Belloc come in for sharp criticism at this point. Among Dr. Messenger's proofs of the thesis is a detailed examination of the Prayer Book of 1549, his method being to compare that Book with its pre-Reformation ancestors. Having adopted this method, it is not surprising that our author finds a great many changes in a "Protestant" direction. Had Dr. Messenger, however, compared the Book of 1549 with the Protestant forms of service on the Continent, we suspect he would have had a very different tale to tell us.

As instances of the worth of his polemic we must content ourselves with two examples:

1. Dr. Messenger refers to the rubric at the end of the 1549 form of the Visitation of the Sick (which still survives in the 1662 Book), where the priest is bidden to instruct the sick person that if for various reasons he cannot receive the Holy Communion, he can "eat and drink spiritually the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." Our author's comment is "so that there is ultimately no difference between 'sacramental' and 'spiritual' communion!" (p. 398, exclamation mark his). Now it happens that the rubric in question is taken straight from the *Sarum Manual*. It would thus seem that the Protestantism of the Book of 1549 goes back rather a long way!! (exclamation marks ours). Indeed, it appears in this particular instance to have its roots in St. Augustine's *crede et manducasti*.

2. Another alleged proof of the Protestantism of the English Liturgy is the rubric in the "Order of Communion" for 1548 (which reappeared in 1662), providing for a reconsecration if the chalice were spent. Mr. Messenger quotes the rubric and comments thus: "Here we have a very important step in the transformation of the Mass from a Sacrifice into a Communion, for the Catholic Church has always taught that the twofold consecration is necessary for the Sacrifice, and consecration under one kind only has never been allowed" (p. 364). If, however, Dr. Messenger will turn to his Missal, he will find immediately before the "Præparatio" a section entitled "*De Defectibus in Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus*"; and under § X. he will see the two provisions: "6. *Si aliquid venenosum ceciderit in Calicem, vel quod provocaret vomitum, vinum consecratum reponendum est in alio Calice, et aliud vinum cum aqua apponendum denuo consecrandum. . . .* 7. *Si aliquod venenatum contigerit Hostiam consecratam, tunc alteram consecret et sumet in eo modo, quo dictum est. . . .*" We merely make our author's words our own: "Comment is needless!" (p. 364).

One final quotation and we have done. "From February 2nd, 1535, then, the Church of England was merely a department of the State, deriving its authority from the King" (p. 240). We hope we have said enough to shew that Dr. Messenger's book is not to be missed by those who want entertainment and stimulus, nor to be taken seriously by those who want history.

F. L. CROSS.

THE GRACE OF GOD IN FAITH AND PHILOSOPHY. By L. Hodgson, D.D. Longmans. 6s.

Here is an irenicon of the proper quality. It recognizes both the strength and the weakness of the parties to be reconciled and recognizes also what each party has to gain from the desired reconciliation. Canon Hodgson, of course, understands the Catholic doctrine of divine Grace, and, through personal contacts with pastors in the Lutheran Church in Germany, he also understands the Protestant doctrine. It is somewhat surprising to discover how wide is the gulf that separates the Protestants in this country from the Protestants on the Continent. For most Protestants in this country the contrast would be drawn between Nature and Grace, but for the Protestants on the Continent the contrast is drawn between Wrath and Grace. There are other differences no less fundamental, but since these are so concisely stated on p. 33 there is no need to enumerate them here. It is enough to say that Canon Hodgson's convincing argument and persuasive manner will do much to bring about a better understanding of one another on the part of both Catholic and Protestant theologians.

The book, however, does far more than examine these differences of doctrine; it also makes a penetrating investigation into the philosophy and experience of Grace. Our only regret is that the course of lectures under the Bishop Paddock Trust was limited to seven at most. But for this restriction Canon Hodgson would doubtless have given us a fuller study of the psychology of Grace. This would have balanced the argument and would have added immensely to the value of the book.

Canon Hodgson stands by the Great Tradition in Philosophy. That is to say, he approaches his subject from the standpoint of rationalism, idealism, and realism, rather than from the side of empiricism, individualism and nominalism. But so well aware is he of the defects on his side and of the advantages belonging to the other side, that he reaches a conclusion that might equally well have been reached by a thinker approaching the subject from the alternative starting-point. In this respect, too, therefore, the book is an irenicon. To the reviewer it appears that the facts here presented would have fitted better into a simple framework of empirical philosophy than into the elaborate framework fashioned by the Great Tradition. But admittedly we should have needed an empiricist as courageous as Canon Hodgson in accommodating the frame to the picture.

A few illustrations may serve to shew that in philosophy and in theology alike there is a Geneva where a better under-

standing of differences and a peaceful settlement may lead to mutual gain. As soon as he begins his examination of Faith (p. 14), Canon Hodgson very properly prefers the concrete individual to the abstract principle. But this concedes that the abstract truth, the general idea, has no reality of its own: the individuals alone are real. Wherefore, "it often happens that we are in a position to speak with far greater certainty on the questions of principle than of empirical fact" (p. 165). This is well said, and it concedes much to empiricism. Other concessions, no less important, are magnanimously allowed. History, it is recognized, consists of individualities, not movements (pp. 21, 80, 81, 124). Morality, it is recognized, is a matter of good persons and not of "Goodness" (pp. 79, 88, 99). But is all this compatible with the Great Tradition? Does it not require a nominalist logic and an empiricist philosophy? When we are led on to envisage a goal for history and morality the dilemma becomes all the more apparent. The process of historic and moral development must be a dynamic process (pp. 65, 88, 106). But can such a process lead to a static goal? Must not the goal also be dynamic—that is to say, must it not await real existence (although foreseeable in vision), until it is creatively achieved? The historic goal, the æsthetic ideal and the moral end are not realities already existent independently of their achievement. "Say not the struggle nought availeth." Say rather that by the Grace of God working in us the struggle leads to conquests which cannot otherwise be made. "God could not make Antonio's violins without Antonio."

This brings us to a distinction so well made by Canon Hodgson, the distinction between Prophetism and Apocalyptic. It is the Apocalypticist's goal that already exists, the Prophet's vision waits to be realized. Jesus (for all that has been said to the contrary by the eschatologists) is in the line of the prophets (p. 83). The Kingdom of God is realized when individuals by the Grace of God become fellow-workers with God. In so far as their influence is effective, or better to say, in so far as they become mediators of the Grace of God, divine Providence overrules human history.

But since the process is a real process, the struggle a real struggle, evil is a real element in the process. Here as elsewhere Canon Hodgson is determined to be true to the facts of experience whatever the consequences for this or that theory. Evil is real within the process, but by its very nature as negative, antagonistic, parasitic, it can have no reality apart from the process: there is nothing in evil which can make it a real element in any attained goal. Its continued existence depends upon the frustration of the process. The treatment of evil (pp. 133-134)

in this book is a good example of Canon Hodgson's intellectual sincerity.

If personal experience is accepted as the basis from which speculation must start, and to which it must return for its verification, it follows that the criterion of truth must include far more than logical consistency. The intellect is sorely tempted to attribute reality to abstractions. Intellectual consistency is not enough; self-authenticating goodness must also be included in our criterion (pp. 112, 117, 132). But personal experience is always social experience, and it must be recognized that goodness is an experience that is entered into by persons in fellowship and includes creative activity and emotional satisfaction. The Great Tradition in philosophy has always been uneasy about the part played in experience by emotion. It has tended to exclude emotion as at best irrelevant and at worst inimical to the security of its intellectual system. Canon Hodgson, however, is more deeply concerned to be loyal to the witness of the Christian revelation and experience than to any Philosophical School. It is just this loyalty to religious witness that makes his contribution to theology and philosophy so valuable. Time and again he insists upon the recognition of a tension between irreconcilables. Instead of seeking logical consistency by denying one or other of the propositions, he boldly affirms that since experience posits both, experience needs both, and experience will make a harmony which would be impossible without both (pp. 106, 112, 176, 178). It is in this connection that Canon Hodgson criticizes so helpfully the followers of both Barth and Buchman (pp. 157-159).

The purpose of these lectures cannot be better given than in the words of the lecturer himself. "We are not trying to philosophize about the Christian life from some standpoint external to it, but to philosophize about the universe on the basis of our knowledge of the Christian life as known from within" (p. 110). Over against this must be set a fine passage on p. 156 in which this sentence occurs: "Our faith does not depend on psychological analysis of religious experience: it is derived from contemplation of the open activity of God in Christ in the history of the universe." Is truth discovered by looking inwards or by looking outwards? Is the race won by Rationalists or Empiricists, by Catholics or Protestants? Canon Hodgson is able to shew that all have won, and since, to continue the quotation, all are to have prizes, the most appropriate prizes would be copies of this book. And since this is no ordinary race, the prize-winners may be asked to pay for their prize.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

EDWARD STUART TALBOT, 1844-1934. By Gwendolen Stephenson. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Lady Stephenson has written an attractive life of her relative, Bishop Talbot. It is a study, as well as a record: and her reflections, inserted in the narrative from time to time by way of comment or explanation, will seem to all who knew him, at any stage of his long career, to give an impression of him that is both just and true.

My first acquaintance with him was at the other side of the table at which I am writing. I was a freshman, calling on the Warden, to bring certain papers which we had been told to present. "You've forgotten your baptismal certificate," he said: "What will become of you?" as he stared at me through his pebble glasses. Never was I so frightened, though he meant no ill. Years afterwards I told him the story, and he laughed heartily—and immensely enjoyed the joke. Later on, he was wise and kind to me beyond words. Some of us youths were much puzzled about the meaning of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, so we thought we would ask the Warden. He got us together in his room, and took us through the two hymns of Dr. Bright—"Once, only once," etc., and "And now, O Father," etc., clause by clause. With that began my study of Eucharistic theology. Further in my education under him, he started me on other things about which I had asked him: by telling me of Professor W. W. Shirley's *Church in the Apostolic Age*, when I wanted to know how the Church began; and similarly, in regard to the ministry he first put me on the track by commending to me *Our Heritage in the Church*, by Bishop Edward Bickersteth. Both these books are forgotten now. But his great merit was that they gave a lead, which he who would might follow up. And that was Talbot's great gift. He was a leader of thought with the young, and of policy, or action, among those of more responsible age. That too was what we felt, and why we trusted him. He was wise, fatherly, and always accessible. And so it went on during the first eighteen years of the life of his college. These qualities became known to others throughout the University, and beyond. They enabled him to live down the suspicions of our origin; and when he left he had laid the foundations of his College, deep and firm.

One other gift of his came within my direct knowledge, just after he left Oxford. His first year at Leeds was the year of the publication of *Lux Mundi*. Lady Stephenson devotes a whole chapter to it, and she brings out the gift I mean, that of a wise man who can "bring out of his treasure things both new and old." I should suppose that, of the contributors to

that book who were most of them my teachers, while Gore was the prophet, Talbot was he who gave to it both the stability and the elasticity of an epoch-making departure. So, at least, the book has proved. And the "old Warden," as we used to call him, was always to be relied on never to give away the old order, in "faith or discipline," and yet ever to be ready for adjustments and developments as they came to be necessary.

The chapter on Leeds reveals another gift of his: the gift of unerring judgment with which he selected his staff. At Keble his common room consisted of men, laity as well as clergy, who were as devoted to the traditions of the College and its founders, as they were men of ability in their several lines. So at Leeds—"he had the gift of attracting the right type of man to serve with him"—one of them now occupies the highest place in the Anglican Communion.

Then follow "the fifteen years' episcopate of Rochester and Southwark. Reviewing his long life in later years," the Bishop "told his eldest son that he believed the best work he had been allowed to do for God and His Church had been done in the years in South London."

During that time he had refused the see of Lincoln, as St. Albans before; but when the offer of Winchester came, he accepted it. The Prime Minister, in making him the offer, had written that he did not suppose "the dignity and amenities" would appeal to him. But they did. "There was an element in him of the Grand Seigneur." And this illustrates a characteristic that, to us who saw him from time to time in advancing years, always appeared so constant—his joy in life. Little things pleased him beyond expectation; and he liked to be surrounded with friends, young and old. When he resigned the last of his sees, he sent me his crozier to be preserved in the College Chapel, and used by any bishop who should officiate there, on one condition, that, in testimony of his affection for us all, we should have inscribed upon it "The Staff of the First Warden." I believe he treasured every memory, and gave of his best to all.

And for our tribute, what more or better could we say than is conveyed by the words we put upon his memorial in Chapel:

"So he fed them with a faithful and true heart,
And ruled them prudently with all his power"?

B. J. KIDD.

NOTICES

DIVINE HUMANITY. Doctrinal Essays on New Testament Problems.
By W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D. S.P.C.K. 5s.

That fine New Testament scholar Frederick Field gave to the publication of his occasional papers and notes the title *Otium Norvicense*, not meaning at all that they were armchair musings, but that they represented work done in time that was snatched from more exacting duties. Dr. Lowther Clarke's new book is of the same type. Its component parts have been written at different times, and some of them published in *THEOLOGY* and elsewhere in the last few years; and they have the same careful scholarship and originality of thought and research as made all Field's published work a valuable contribution to English divinity.

One of the most striking features of the book is the thorough lexicographical work which underlies it. Dr. Lowther Clarke knows his way about all the standard works of this type, both on the Hebraic and on the Hellenistic side; and he is thus able to throw a clear light on many words and phrases in the New Testament which are often too easily taken as understood. Thus he traces the use of the word "Gospel" and its cognates in the LXX, and shews that its *locus classicus* is to be found in Deutero-Isaiah, where it connotes the eschatological victory of God. The "Gospel" is the good news that "God has ascended His throne," which is what is meant by "the Kingdom of God." And "this Gospel was made His own by Jesus. His supreme greatness on the human side lay in His taking the whole message of Isa. xl.-liii., including the Suffering Servant passages. The message and the messenger were one. That is why the disciples, hearing the message, left all and followed Him."

Other examples of Dr. Lowther Clarke's fruitful study of words are provided by his essay on the word "Church," where it is convincingly shewn that the use of the term *ecclesia* in its universal sense is prior to its application to the local community; and by the valuable note on the origins of the word *episcopos*. But more important and more original than either of these is the opening paper entitled "The Clouds of Heaven: An Eschatological Study," which first appeared in two articles in *THEOLOGY* last year. Dr. Lowther Clarke's thesis, based on a study of similar phrases in the LXX, is that when our Lord spoke of "coming on the clouds of heaven" He alluded not to any "second advent" on earth but to His ascending into heaven, to sit on the throne of His glory. His *Parousia*, that is to say, is His appearance before the Father in heaven, not before men on earth; and it is accomplished at the Ascension. Even a passage like 1 Thess. iv. 16-17, which speaks of His descending "from heaven" to meet "the dead in Christ," does not suggest that He comes down to tread this earth: the phrase is expressive of the welcome which He extends from above to those who are now released to enter His heavenly kingdom. Dr. Lowther Clarke does not mention, though he might do so, the connection between this interpretation and his own interpretation of "the Kingdom of God" alluded to above: each, I think, tends to strengthen the other. The main thesis itself is so novel and startling that one hesitates to express a judgment on it. But there can be no question that Dr. Lowther Clarke has advanced facts and considerations which must be taken into account by all students of New Testament doctrine.

Another noteworthy feature of this book is the use which the author

makes of recent psychological theories, not least of Mr. Dunne's suggestive books *An Experiment with Time* and *The Social Universe*. I must confess to being out of my depth here, and I cannot help feeling that the introduction of these ideas calls for a much longer treatment than is possible in these brief papers. The theories themselves are new to most readers, and therefore not easily grasped without full explanation; and *a fortiori* this is true of their application to New Testament problems. Dr. Lowther Clarke may be right; but his treatment leaves one with a sense of having been possibly "short-circuited" somewhere. Incidentally, Dr. Lowther Clarke pays a well-deserved tribute to Professor Relton's *A Study in Christology*.

Enough has been said to shew that *Divine Humanity* is a book which will repay—as it certainly demands—careful study. The title is singularly well chosen, as Dr. Lowther Clarke never allows the divine and the human in our Lord to fly apart, or forgets one while he pursues a line of thought suggested by the other. Every paper is a study of the Christ of History, and it is along these lines that the future of New Testament theology lies. We hope that it will be widely read.

E. G. SELWYN.

THE PSYCHIC POWERS OF CHRIST. By J. S. M. Ward. Williams and Norgate. 5s.

The author of this book, who is Father Superior of the Abbey of Christ the King, New Barnet, explains at the outset that he belongs to the "Orthodox Catholic Church—that is to say, a branch of the Eastern Church." His avowed object is to attack Modernism, and in particular to establish by proof the truth of the Virgin Birth and the physical Resurrection of our Lord. But defenders of the traditional position on these matters must hesitate before accepting Father Ward's help. For he makes out his case by appealing to spiritualistic and theosophic theories of materialization, astral bodies, levitation, transportation and the like. In regard to the Virgin Birth, Father Ward is not content with the restrained narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke. He relies frankly on the Protevangelium of James, which asserts that our Lord was not born in a human way, but proceeded from His mother by a process which Father Ward describes as dematerialization followed by rematerialization. Such fantastic ideas, if adopted today, can only lead to the same doctrines to which they led in the second and third centuries, that is, Docetism and Gnosticism.

Similarly, the Resurrection and Ascension are explained as instances of dematerialization. At first sight it may seem that this theory offers a way out of the perplexing difficulties associated with the post-resurrection appearances. But two warnings must be borne in mind. First, the theory proves too much. Not unnaturally the author uses it to cover the incident of St. Luke xxiv. 43, in which the risen Christ eats material food in company with His disciples. But beyond this, he illustrates the theory by the phenomena of modern European Spiritualism and Oriental Occultism. Like most observers in these fields, his notion of evidence is not very exacting; and the Christian may at any moment find himself embarrassed rather than helped, if he associates the events of our Lord's life with the questionable records of occult happenings

Secondly, do these dematerializations, even supposing that they are all they claim to be, really take us out of the material world? Allowing that the earliest Christian witnesses may have made mistakes in reporting their experiences, it is yet a certainty that the experiences themselves were of a spiritual nature, and worlds apart from the touch of matter, however attenuated. The Christian must not surrender his birthright, with its undoubted difficulties, in return for the mundane philosophy of Spiritualism.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

THE PREACHER'S THEME TO-DAY. Four Lectures delivered at the College of Preachers, Washington. By William Temple, Archbishop of York. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

The subjects of the four lectures are (1) Revelation; (2) The Incarnation; (3) Sin and Atonement; (4) Christianity, Ethics and Politics. On each the Archbishop has a good deal to say that is wise and suggestive. He deals with the chief intellectual and moral difficulties that are felt by people today, and shews how they are to be met. It should be most useful to all clergy and is one of the best and most suggestive books on the subject-matter of sermons that has appeared for a long time.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

KAGAWA: AN APOSTLE OF JAPAN. By Margaret Baumann. S.P.C.K. 1s.

ST. SERAPHIM OF SAROV. Translated by A. F. Dobbie-Bateman. Published by S.P.C.K. for the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. 1s. 6d.

FROM THEATRE TO CONVENT. Memories of Mother Isabel Mary, C.S.M.V. S.P.C.K. 5s.

My father, who was a very wise man, used to say that wicked people were all very much alike, but that good people are infinitely diverse; and this because the devil has only a few stock sins, which his followers repeat *ad nauseam*, while God's infinite beauty can be refracted in a limitless number of saintly souls. And yet I have often heard the remark, "How dull it would be if we were all good! We should all be exactly alike."

A glance at these three biographies should dispel anyone's latent fear that saints must all be cast in the same mould.

Here is Kagawa, one sickly young Japanese student, without money, without influence, with no lever to move a cruel materialistic society, but a passionate love of his neighbour. Kagawa learnt love from Jesus of Nazareth, and proceeded to love everyone with whom he came in contact. He loved a beggar, from whom he caught a disabling disease of the eyes, he loved gamblers who fought with knives, he loved crying children who disturbed his few hours of rest—no one was too foul or too wicked or too tiresome for Kagawa to love.

The story of what this man accomplished singlehanded is told in somewhat crude and melodramatic fashion, but it stirs the heart, for all that. Surely, though, the authoress has given a very superficial account of Kagawa's philosophy. Has she not described what she would like her hero to believe, rather than what he actually does believe, and unconsciously substituted her own theories and convictions for his?

To go to the Sarov Monastery, the place where St. Seraphim died

in 1833, is a far journey from present-day Japan, and the strange old monk a complete contrast to the young reformer. St. Seraphim was for many years a forest-hermit, keeping the severe rule of St. Pachomius. He was a lover of silence, and when illness forced him to return to the monastery, he shut himself into his cell and, without speaking, continued his penitential life.

In his later years he became the director of the Diveyev convent, and lifted some of the nuns to great heights of sanctity.

A few of his sayings here reported, and the "Conversation with Nicholas Motovilov concerning the aim of the Christian life," are enough to place him among the great mystics of the Church. Doubtless his solitude, his penances, his incessant devotions and prayers were but the laborious hewing of stone for an altar, the laying-ready of sacrifice. A waste of time, some men think, when altars and offerings may be more cheaply procured by other means. St. Seraphim built and prepared as the Spirit bade him, and fire from heaven marked the acceptance of what he gave.

And now here we are in England, and Wantage is only a few miles away. This biography of the Community's fifth Mother Superior will be bought by readers interested in convents, by readers interested in the stage, and by readers interested in the religious life and life behind the footlights.

Perhaps the most revealing pages of the book are those on which the portraits appear. Little Isabel Emilie, such a good and prim child, with Mamma in a bonnet, and big sister in funny cape and hat; the gloriously beautiful actress, eighteen years old; the Mother Superior, aged sixty-nine, strong and intelligent, shrewd and warm-hearted, her zest for life still keen; the Mother, very old and weary, looking at death, and, through death, to fuller life beyond.

Readers will pass different verdicts. "What a fool the woman was!—lovely enough to be a king's mistress, and so gifted, too—why did she go and bury herself in a convent like that?" "She could have done so much good where she was. Good women, women with *ideals*, you know, are so much wanted on the stage." "Yes, but does not God need the *best*? Just because she *was* so beautiful and so brave and so loving, was not she the right person to be a nun?" "God called her. Is not that really all that one can say?"

Kagawa, St. Seraphim, Mother Isabel Mary—could any three people be more different? And how much the world needed each one of them! How much the world needs more, and yet more, saints of God.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

FOLKLORE OF THE HOLY LAND. By J. E. Hanauer. London, Sheldon Press. New and enlarged edition, 1935. 10s. 6d. net.

As the meeting-place of many streams of culture both in ancient and more recent times, Palestine has become a reservoir of traditional lore collected from varied sources, Jewish, Christian and Moslem. It is therefore a happy hunting ground for the folklorist, and if Canon Hanauer would hardly claim to be a scientifically trained field worker in this department of highly specialized research, he has had unique opportunities of gaining first-hand knowledge of the available material. As Miss Constance Padwick points out in the foreword, "Palestine is his land by length of days and love, his place of work and his playground," and if his book "did not come into the world as a labelled and indexed work of scholarship

but as the fruit of the playtime of an unselfish life," he has "long been known in Jerusalem as the depository of all manner of lore about the city's past." The stories he has collected are "the fruit of his understanding friendship and unfailing joy in the little twists of thought and humour shewn him without shyness by his friends who knew that, like themselves, he was bound to that land in love and long custom."

The book is divided into three sections. The first of these contains the Moslem legend concerning the Tablet of Destiny and Creation, together with stories of Semitic heroes, including Noah and Og, Lot and the Tree of the Cross, and the well-known El Khudr, or Evergreen Man, in his various manifestations as Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, Elijah and St. George. In the second section an interesting series of anecdotes are recorded, dealing with diverse subjects such as the Jaffa Gate at Jerusalem, the grave of the Amir Ala ed din 'Aidi Ghadi ibn 'Abdallah el Kebkebi in the cemetery of the Pool of Mamilla, tales respecting the means used by certain remarkable persons for the detection of criminals, reminiscent of the Biblical account of Solomon and the two mothers, and an account of the anniversary called the Zaragoza Purim held to commemorate the deliverance of the Jews in the capital of Aragon from a great peril. The concluding section of the book is devoted to collectanea described as "illustrating social ideas, superstitions, animal and plant lore, etc."

The material brought together in this volume, however, does not lend itself very readily to the threefold division adopted, or indeed to any method of classification. The general impression left upon the reader is that of a series of isolated items (some well known to students of the subject, others less familiar) collected from a variety of sources without much thought having been given to continuity or scientific arrangement. A good deal of work has been done in this field since the first edition of Canon Hanauer's book appeared in 1907, but the production of a new and enlarged edition shews that it still meets the needs of those who want a popular introduction to certain elements of the folklore of the Holy Land.

E. O. JAMES.

THE PLACE OF UNDERSTANDING. By Bede Frost. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 284. 5s. net.

PHILOSOPHY AND FAITH. By Dorothy M. Emmet, Lecturer in Philosophy of Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne. S.C.M. Pp. 164. 4s. 6d.

It would seem that there is little enough of that learned leisure in places where it used to be looked for to allow the steady study by the brightest minds which once made our Church the "stupor mundi." Practical religion, financial stress, and Committees have changed all that. But it seems as if theology is finding new sources of life amid these regrettable conditions. There are the "religious" with thinkers like Father Hebert among them, and there are the new Universities with professors like E. O. James, to say nothing of that bright centre the staff of London University.

I have set the above books side by side, not because they are similar in outlook, for they are antipodal, but because they illustrate so well the intellectual stream that is springing from these two new sources.

Dom Bede's *The Place of Understanding* is a little masterpiece of apologetic, remarkably clearly expressed, well arranged, deeply set in the

foundations of dogmatic conviction, shooting, as it conducts its own historic argument, the barbed arrows of a most devastating criticism on the whole crew of scientists and humanists of today, whose creed, as he says, is *Non credo in Deum*. Serious thinkers? Not at all. "To be admitted to that select set one must have surrendered reason with Lord Russell, humour with Mr. McCabe, humility with Mr. Murry, morality with the new moralists, knowledge of what religion is with J. B. S. Haldane and most moderns who write about it, together with the innate tendency to believe that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in one's own fool-proof, water-tight, and entirely infallible philosophy."

Dom Bede treads the well-trodden path of Catholic philosophy: "With S. Thomas Aquinas we reply that the existence of God and other like truths about God can be known by natural reason." There is no need to worry about the power of the mind to see *what* things are, as well as *that* they are; the traditional five causes are incontrovertible. Kant needs only to be contradicted, it is too silly to examine Idealism closely. We may not like this easy disposal of the Idealists, but possibly ordinary readers will not be so averse to grant this major premiss as the student of philosophy. At any rate, the clear-cut force of the Catholic argument can hardly ever have been presented in a more concise, clear, and trenchant manner.

Miss Emmet is one of the keen analytic minds, which will have none of the Aristotelian dogma; she sees in the craft of philosophy which she adorns the continual necessity of inquiry. For her as for Socrates "the unexamined life is a life not liveable for man." But she is not one of Dom Bede's pretenders to infallibility. She is sincerely impressed by the fact of religion, and open to its influence in the Godward direction. Her book is designed to shew the unavoidable tension between the analytic and the dogmatic, the urge to inquire and to go on inquiring without haste or rest, while still conscious of the reality of the religious light. She thinks that however impossible a synthesis may be, while we still see through a glass darkly, yet that "it is well for religious people and philosophers to come together and try to understand each other's language." She refuses to make an impassable gulf between philosophy and religion, making philosophy negative and critical, religion dogmatic and authoritative; for both are lives of faith, and both contribute to the life of the Church as a whole. The will of a philosopher committed to serve the life of the whole through his particular work gives him a rightful place in the Christian fellowship, though if he be actually a teacher, difficult tensions must inevitably arise.

It is a very sincere and thoughtful book.

W. J. FERRAR.

ROBERT GROSSETÊTE: THE DEFENDER OF OUR CHURCH AND OUR LIBERTIES. By B. C. Boulter. S.P.C.K. 5s.

This short and well-written biography of the great Bishop, who held the See of Lincoln in the first half of the thirteenth century, is full of interest, for the life-story of Robert Grossetête is indeed remarkable.

He was of humble origin, the son of a smallholder in Suffolk, yet by sheer force of character and strength of purpose, combined with unflinching integrity, he rose from the position of a poor Scholar at Oxford to be the Chancellor of the University with a European reputation. Then as Bishop of Lincoln he became the most powerful and influential Churchman

in the realm, and the tireless defender of the rights and liberties of the clergy and people of the English Church against the exactions of King and Pope alike. In his reforming zeal, as well as in his pastoral activities throughout his immense diocese, which then extended from the Humber to the Thames, and included Oxford, his lifelong friend the learned Franciscan Adam Marsh was his constant supporter. The Bishop died in 1253, and was buried in Lincoln Cathedral not far from the resting-place of his famous predecessor St. Hugh. Of them our author truly says: "Two great souls they were; great patriots, makers of England, lovers of the poor, unflinching foes of tyranny. To them our Church and State owe much."

THE GOSPEL OF FULFILMENT: A STUDY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By Robert A. Henderson. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Our Lord was *put* to death by the Romans as a royal pretender; *delivered* unto death by the Jews as a "divine deceiver," and He *accepted* death as the Suffering Servant of God, who should bear the sins of many.

This thought-provoking, and often quite beautiful, book is chiefly concerned with the fulfilment of Jewish Messianic prophecy in the person of our Lord, and with the consciousness of this fulfilment in the minds of Jesus and the beloved disciple.

For him, as for many of the old evangelicals, every action and word of our Lord's are charged with symbolic meaning, and so interpreted by St. John, whose purpose in writing his Gospel was "not to tell the story afresh, but to impart his own apostolic vision of our Lord's eternal glory."

The Gospel of Fulfilment is further evidence of the swing of the theological pendulum away from the Christ of Liberal Protestantism, back to the Christ of apocalyptic and eschatology, and its devotional appeal to those familiar with these lines of thought is unquestionable. But are the publishers and the writer a *shade* too optimistic with regard to the "ordinary lay men and women" for whom they say it was intentionally written?

MARGUERITE HOWSE.

THESE HOLY MYSTERIES. By A. E. Baker. Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

This study of the Eucharist is intended for the ordinarily educated reader who is prepared to think. The author discusses the nature of sacraments, the meaning of the real presence, the sacrifice of the Mass, the drama of the Liturgy, familiar matters no doubt, but freshly treated. The author is primarily concerned with the social character and implications of the Eucharist, a subject which needs much emphasis in face of prevalent individualism, and the final chapter in which he deals with the priesthood of the laity and the duty of the Church in regard to present economic conditions should produce much searching of heart.

The early part of the book is sometimes more rhetorical than accurate, and contains some strange statements. On page 11 the author says: "When episcopal ordination has expressed and helped to intensify the real apostolic quality in men, then 'holy orders' have been orders from God." If that is so, then an unworthy priest is no priest, a somewhat perilous doctrine. Again, "If the Eucharist were greatly understood and greatly and bravely expressed in the life of the Church as a fellowship of men

and women . . ." (p. 12). Apart from its rhetorical form this is inaccurate; the Christian fellowship is the Church, the Eucharist deepens that fellowship, but it is not its essence. On page 13 the author speaks of "the divinity of the material universe," but the universe is not divine, it is created. On page 18 we are told that "the world exists to be a link between persons." The world certainly is or may be such a link, but we cannot say that that is the sole purpose of its existence, especially since the created persons concerned are part of it. A similarly anthropocentric confusion of thought occurs on page 25: "Law and destiny and nature exist to reveal God to man, and to discipline man, by that revelation, to become a person like God." On page 18 we are told that "for more than a century and a half, since Bishop Berkeley wrote in England and Immanuel Kant in Germany, it has not been necessary to prove that something exists in addition to the things that we can taste and touch and see and hear and smell." But after all there were some true philosophy and some sane philosophers before Kant and Berkeley, and it would have been quite unnecessary to prove the existence of non-material things to St. Thomas Aquinas. It is also a mistake to say that the Schoolmen were Aristotelians (p. 99). Some of them were, but some had never studied him at all, and others distrusted him so strongly that St. Thomas got into severe trouble for venturing to found his teaching on so dangerous an ally. In these places and some others the author's thought is indeed of clarification, but the work improves as it proceeds; Canon Baker says many good and useful things, and on the whole his teaching is greatly to be commended.

F. P. HARTON.

AN AUGUSTINE SYNTHESIS. Arranged by Erich Przywara, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

This is an important book; it consists of 496 pages of selections from St. Augustine without commentary, carefully arranged to exhibit the whole fulness of his teaching by one of the greatest of present-day scholars of the Saint. The extracts are taken from all parts of his works, and vary in length from two or three lines to several pages. An author may be seriously misrepresented by undue compression in quotation, but that mistake has not been made here; for instance, the much quoted maxim *Ama e fac quod vis* taken by itself may be, and has been, taken to support views quite alien to those of its author, but it is given here in its context by which it is explained and safeguarded. Opinions will always differ as to where extracts should begin and end, so that in some cases one may feel that these are perhaps almost too full, but that is a good fault, if fault it be, and the reader may be sure that in studying this volume he will miss nothing that is essential to the thought of the great Doctor. St. Augustine's works occupy thirteen volumes of Migne, and it is a great comfort to be taken in hand by so great a scholar as Father Przywara, and to be told, "This is what you *must* read," especially when the translation is good and pleasant.

Father Martindale in an introduction, which is perhaps somewhat too breezy, tells us that the book is not intended for "intellectuals," but for the ordinary reader, who, he hopes, "may become Augustine-minded" by its perusal. This he can hardly help doing if he takes the work a little at a time and really absorbs it, and his gain will be immense. Modern

theology owes much of its thinness to the widely prevalent ignorance of the great theologians at first-hand; a revival of "Augustine-mindedness" would do much to remedy this state of affairs, since the Bishop of Hippo is truly the father of Western theology. To the clergy this book should be worth many manuals on the subject, while its language should help them both in their prayers and in their own teaching, besides fixing great truths in their minds in epigrammatic form.

Frankly, we find the titles of the sections and chapters into which Father Przywara has divided his book, and which Father Martindale finds "thrilling" and "absolutely challenging," the least satisfactory part of the work. Such titles should explain in ordinary language what the section is about and thus facilitate reference, but we do not find that such titles as "Blessed Truth," "Flesh and Blood," "Man Straightway to God," "Man-Abyss," "Night in Love," and suchlike do so; they may be stimulating to some minds, evidently they are so to Father Martindale, but they are too suggestive of cheese in a mousetrap to others, besides being of little use once their primary purpose is accomplished.

Another great disadvantage to the student (and surely in this case even the non-intellectual should be a student) is the absence of an index, and it is sincerely to be hoped that this defect may be remedied in the second edition which will surely be required.

F. P. HARTON.

THE COMING OF THE MONSTER. By Owen Francis Dudley. Longmans. Green and Co. 6s.

"The writer sees two international forces of consequence in the world today: the Papacy with Catholic solidarity behind, standing for a Divine order, and law on earth; and 'the Great Revolution that is afoot' against all that Catholicism upholds." The reader who is prepared to accept this dictum without investigation will probably overlook the utter bad writing of this book: the half-truths twisted away from reality, the puppet characters, the futile style, the lack of construction and form which are supposed to be justified by the claim that the work is written in the manner of the cinema. That Father Dudley's books apparently sell by the thousand is a pitiful comment on the intellectual level of Roman propaganda.

V. I. RUFFER.

GOD AND MAMMON. By François Mauriac. Essays in Order, New Series, No. 1. Sheed and Ward. 2s. 6d.

That morbid exhibitionism is by no means the prerogative of Groupers only, this "essay" illustrates abundantly. It is an elaborate, discursive, wearisome self-scrutiny inspired by a statement of André Gide's that Mauriac "loves God without losing sight of Mammon." One realizes why moralists and theologians are apt to be so suspicious of "aestheticism," used as it is with such ease and frequency to justify the intense absorption in self, the misdirection of ability, the spleen and bitterness displayed in this essay. There is a strong tendency in militant Catholic circles, at home and abroad, to substitute the vision of the corruption of the human heart for the vision of God. "Show the light of Thy countenance and we shall be whole"; but that light is so seldom sought under the banner of aesthetics.

V. I. RUFFER.